

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: FEBRUARY 18, 2020

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: MORGAN ROUTT, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

SUBJECT: BUDGET MEMO #01: PROPOSED SCHEDULE AND ADD/DELETE PROCESS FOR FY 2021 BUDGET DELIBERATIONS

This memo outlines the proposed schedule for FY 2021 budget deliberations and the add/delete process. This memo includes:

1. The due date for budget questions to receive responses in time for add/delete (**Friday, March 27**).
2. An overview of the add/delete process and timeline, including the deadline for add/delete proposals (**Thursday, April 16**). Staff requests notification of potential add/items requiring an ordinance no later than Monday, April 6 to docket for public hearing in April and final passage at budget adoption. City Council established the add/delete process rules of engagement in Resolution No. 2858 adopted on November 12, 2019.
3. A timeline with specific dates for public hearings, publication of public notices, work sessions and budget-related legislative or special meetings.

Staff Responses to Council Questions on the Proposed Budget and Capital Improvement Program

All questions from members of Council should be sent to OMB Director Morgan Rountt by e-mail or asked at Council meetings or work sessions. Staff's practice is to respond to all questions as soon as feasible. The City Manager may also discuss questions with individual members as needed. The sooner a question is asked, the more likely it is to receive a full and complete answer in time to influence the add/delete process. Depending on the complexity of the question, information requested after Friday, March 27 may be too late for Council members to receive a complete response by Thursday, April 16, the due date for the City Council budget add/delete proposal forms. *New for FY 2021: City Council members will be asked to identify which questions relate to potential add/delete adjustments. OMB will use this information to prioritize those responses for quicker turnaround times. Non-add/delete-related budget questions will be prioritized next, followed by non-budget-related questions about City policies and services. Non-add/delete-related questions requiring significant staff research or analysis may be extended beyond the budget process with the requesting Council member's permission to focus on add/delete-related and budget-related responses.*

Add/Delete Process: The City Council shall follow the process outlined below. This process is compliant with the add/delete process as outlined in City Council adopted Resolution 2914.

1. Continue use of the add/delete spreadsheet that was produced by OMB prior to the FY 2016 budget process and reintroduced in the FY 2017 budget process.

2. A City Council budget proposal form will be required in order to add or delete anything from the City Manager's Proposed Budget. The form will require the following prior to Council consideration:
 - Additional information related to how the change advances the Council's goals/priorities.
 - Additional information related to how this change impacts the performance of that program, service or goal.
 - The support of at least 3 of 7 Council members (the original sponsor and two-co sponsors).
 - It must be accompanied by an add/delete spreadsheet prepared by the Council member or OMB in which the sum of the individual Council member's adds and deletes, including items originally sponsored by that member, are in balance or produce a revenue surplus.
 - Notice of any potential add/delete proposal requiring a change to a City Ordinance or requiring a new ordinance must be submitted to staff eight days prior to the first legislative meeting in April in order for the item to be introduced and docketed for the April public hearing [for FY 2021, April 6]
3. The completed City Council budget proposal form must be returned to the Office of Management & Budget (OMB), with each of the steps from #2 above completed, at least 13 days prior to the adoption of the budget [for FY 2021, April 16].
4. City Council will hold a second budget public hearing to receive feedback on the preliminary add/delete items submitted by City Council Members [for FY 2021, April 18].
5. A combined list of all City Council budget proposals that meet the criteria in #2, any technical adjustments from OMB, and any City Manager recommended changes, will be provided and discussed at a City Council meeting in April [for FY 2021, April 21].
6. Council will work with OMB to refine/develop funding figures based on the proposals submitted, to be completed 7 days prior to budget adoption [for FY 2021, April 22].
7. Completed Council budget proposals, with funding, will be circulated to Council and the public the Friday prior to budget adoption [for FY 2021, April 24].
8. City Council will be required to keep the budget in balance once all decisions are made.
9. Budget Adoption will occur on April 29, 2020 with all City Council Budget Proposals, those approved and those not approved, made public upon adoption of the budget.

The City Council budget proposal form is attached to this memo. Please fill out the form electronically (preferred for ease in distributing) or by hand and submit the completed forms to OMB by Thursday, April 16, 2020.

Proposed Schedule

Below is the timeline recommended by staff for the FY 2021 budget approval process, based on the budget calendar adopted by City Council. The timeline includes the actions required by statute to be taken by certain dates for adopting the real estate and personal property tax ordinances.

Other considerations that shaped this schedule include:

- The budget public hearing is to be held Monday, March 9, 2020 at 5:30 pm. This schedule allows Council to have public input from the hearing available to it before it establishes a maximum real estate tax rate to advertise on Tuesday, March 10, 2020. ***New for FY 2021: the public hearing start time is proposed to move from 4:00 pm in recent years, subject to Council confirmation.***
- City Council should decide the maximum possible real estate tax rate to advertise 30 days before a public hearing on that rate is held. Such a public hearing is scheduled for Saturday, April 18, 2020. **Therefore, Council must make this maximum real estate tax rate determination during a regularly scheduled legislative meeting on Tuesday, March 10, 2020.** The same schedule applies to the personal property tax rate.

FY 2021 BUDGET WORK SESSION AND HEARING SCHEDULE ACTION DATES

Tuesday, February 18, 2020	Proposed Budget Presentation and Work Session #1: Revenues City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (7:00 PM)
Thursday, February 20, 2020	Public Budget Presentation Charles E. Beatley, Jr. Central Library, 5005 Duke St. (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, February 26, 2020	Work Session #2: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, March 4, 2020	Work Session #3: Alexandria City Public Schools ACPS Central Office (1340 Braddock Place), Board Room (7:00 PM)
Monday, March 9, 2020	Budget Public Hearing City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (5:30 PM) - Proposed Time change is subject to Council confirmation
Tuesday, March 10, 2020	Introduce Tax Rate Ordinance and Set the Maximum Tax Rate City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, March 11, 2020	Work Session #4: City Employee Compensation City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, March 18, 2020	Work Session #5: Accountable, Effective & Well-Managed Government and Healthy & Thriving Residents Focus Areas City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, March 25, 2020	Work Session #6: Livable, Green, and Prospering City Focus Area City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, April 1, 2020	Work Session #7: Safe, Secure and Just Community Focus Area City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Monday, April 13, 2020	Work Session #8: BFAAC / Follow-up Topics City Hall (301 King St.), Sister Cities Room #1101 (7:00 PM)
Saturday, April 18, 2020	Tax Rate Public Hearing and 2nd Budget Public Hearing City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (9:30 AM)
Tuesday, April 21, 2020	Work Session #9: Preliminary Add/Delete City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (7:00 PM)
Monday, April 27, 2020	Work Session #10: Final Add/Delete City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (7:00 PM)
Wednesday, April 29, 2020	Budget Adoption City Hall (301 King St.), City Council Chambers (7:00 PM)

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – City Council Budget Proposal Form

ADD/DELETE FORM

FY 2021 CITY COUNCIL BUDGET PROPOSAL



DATE:

CITY COUNCIL SPONSOR:

CO-SPONSOR:

<input type="checkbox"/> Mayor Wilson	<input type="checkbox"/> Councilman Aguirre	<input type="checkbox"/> Councilwoman Pepper
<input type="checkbox"/> Vice Mayor Bennett-Parker	<input type="checkbox"/> Councilman Chapman	<input type="checkbox"/> Councilman Seifeldein
	<input type="checkbox"/> Councilwoman Jackson	

REQUESTED CHANGE AFFECTS:

<input type="checkbox"/> OPERATING	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPITAL	<input type="checkbox"/> BOTH
------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

ADD/DELETE



ADD

DELETE

INITIATIVE/PROGRAMMATIC ADJUSTMENT	WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THIS ADD/DELETE?				
	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025
FIVE YEAR IMPACT					
<i>OPERATING EXPENDITURE/(SAVINGS)</i>					
<i>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE/(SAVINGS)</i>					
<i>IS THIS CHANGE ALIGNED WITH THE CITY COUNCIL GUIDANCE? HOW?</i>					
<i>DOES THIS ADD/DELETE IMPACT LEVERAGING OF OTHER FUNDS (I.E. MATCHING FUNDS FROM GRANTS, STATE PROGRAMS OR FEDERAL PROGRAMS)? HOW?</i>					
If an ADD, how do you plan to offset addition costs?	<input type="checkbox"/> REVENUE ENHANCEMENT <input type="checkbox"/> DELETE FROM OTHER AREA		Please Explain (i.e. which delete(s) corresponds to this add)		
If a DELETE, what do you plan to do with the savings?	<input type="checkbox"/> ADD TO OTHER AREA <input type="checkbox"/> ADD TO FUND BALANCE <input type="checkbox"/> CONTRIBUTE TO TAX/FEE REDUCTION		Please Explain (i.e. which add(s) corresponds to this delete)		

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 8, 2020

Question:

How many commercial customers, paying and non-paying, participate in the City's waste collection service and is there potential for additional revenue?

Response:

The City provides waste collection service to approximately 250 small businesses operating within residential neighborhoods which pay a commercial refuse fee of \$373 per year and approximately 20 commercial businesses near King and Union Streets that utilize a City-owned compactor room on Union Street and pay an equivalent fee to their usage. The City also provides collection to approximately 65 schools, government buildings, and 763 public housing units as well as a number of non-profit and faith-based organizations. These accounts have historically not been charged a fee and thereby covered through the General Fund. T&ES is currently conducting a review of all customers served and its billing status with GIS and the Real Estate Office to conduct a thorough and equitable audit of customers served vs. customers billed. Initial results on the commercial side show as many as 300 unbilled customers receiving service with a potential revenue of over \$100,000. Staff are reviewing both unbilled customers on the commercial side as well as reviewing the policy of accounts which have been historically fee exempt to reveal untapped revenues. The review underway will identify all non-paying customers and their status as for-profit, not-for-profit, or faith based. From the results of the review, staff will make a recommendation regarding next steps, including what fee exempting should stay in place, what exemptions should be eliminated, and what the fee rate(s) should be for these commercial accounts where a fee is recommended.

In addition, staff is working closely with the GIS team who have developed an application which will update served and billed customers on an ongoing basis so that the list of customers can be kept always up-to-date.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 18, 2020

Question: In a recent conversation with the City Manager, he indicated that the City's promotional policy was far more generous than our neighboring jurisdictions. Can you provide Council with this regional comparison? (Vice Mayor Bennett-Parker)

Response:

The Department of Human Resources in consult with Segal Waters Consulting has confirmed that the City's drop down promotion policies related to pay increases exceed best practices and the policies of peer organizations.

Prior to 2013 when City Manager Young enacted changes, employees who were promoted received an 8.5% increase plus a transition payment to the next highest step. The City's current policy changed the way that pay increases are calculated by keeping employee pay at their existing step as long as the increase does not exceed 20% plus placement to the next highest step. The latter means that, if a salary falls between two steps, the employee would be granted the higher step. This method of granting pay as a result of promotion does not consider the employee's experience, education, or internal equity. In addition to applying this rule for promotions, the rule that employees can maintain their step is also applied when an employee is granted a career ladder elevation, when an encumbered position is reclassified, and when a classification with encumbered positions is reallocated to a higher grade.

When compared to peer organizations, the 20% maximum increase is very generous. Table 1 below is a summary of the promotion policies provided by the City of Alexandria's peer jurisdictions. (See attachment "Peer Promotional Policies" for additional details.)

Table 1. Comparator Jurisdiction Promotion Policies	
Peer Organization	Potential Pay Increase Percentage
Arlington County	10%-12%
Fairfax County	5%-15%
Loudoun County	At least 5% but can be exceeded based on qualifications
Montgomery County	5%-15%
Prince George's County	Up to 10% (general employee salaries are determined by the HR Director)

Prince William County	Salary selection up to midpoint is at manager discretion, with sworn/uniformed employees receiving 5%-10%
City of Alexandria	Up to 20%

Given the City’s maximum increase of 20%, employees have the potential of increasing their earnings very quickly as they change positions, regardless of experience, education or internal equity. Employees will also be placed at a higher step on the pay scale, moving them to the top of the pay range faster. An example of an employee’s actual increases over a five-year period is provided below in Table 2.

Table 2. Example – Alexandria Employee Increases Over 5-Year Period

Date	Classification	Grade	Step	Salary	% Increase	Action
8/12/2013	Classification I	10	10	\$ 50,232.00	-	Hired
8/2/2014	Classification I	10	11	\$ 51,900.42	3.32%	Annual Step Increase
9/13/2014	Classification II	13	11	\$ 59,603.96	14.84%	Promotion
8/1/2015	Classification II	13	12	\$ 61,585.68	3.32%	Annual Step Increase
6/4/2016	Classification III	14	12	\$ 64,693.72	5.05%	Promotion
7/30/2016	Classification III	14	13	\$ 66,843.14	3.32%	Annual Step Increase
7/29/2017	Classification III	14	14	\$ 68,381.82	2.30%	Annual Step Increase
12/2/2017	Classification IV	23	5	\$ 84,437.34	23.48%	Promotion
7/28/2018	Classification IV	23	6	\$ 87,392.76	3.50%	Annual Step Increase
11/3/2018	Classification IV	23	8	\$ 92,531.66	5.88%	Annual Step Increase + Additional Step
Overall Increase				\$ 42,299.66	84.21%	

Attachment 1 – Peer Promotional Policies

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 18, 2020

Question:

What resources would be necessary for OHA to create a more pro-active or robust Oral History Program?

Response:

Staff's recommendation to create a more proactive or robust Oral History Program would cost \$106,882 in the first year and \$105,557 annually in future years and take the following phased in approach.

Phase 1 – Expand the Oral History Program

Establish a robust and proactive oral history program, one that seeks out and prioritizes the voices of residents with compelling stories to tell before they are lost and engages with community volunteers to record, transcribe, and share our collective past. Establish and streamline a process for prioritizing and contacting oral history candidates that involves various stakeholders.

Utilizing new funding resources and a core of highly trained volunteers, shed light on past oral histories, likely filled with incredible details about early Alexandria, by transcribing and sharing the backlog of oral histories in our collection.

Phase 2 – Oral History in the Community

Phase two would focus on three main goals:

- 1.) Make Alexandria Legacies' Oral History program a vital and relevant part of the City's offerings to residents and visitors.
- 2.) Tie the Oral History program to the EJI programs and the City's commitment to social justice. We have discovered descendants of the men lynched and of people who participated in or were touched by the 1890s lynchings. It would be valuable to get their perspectives.
- 3.) Make oral history a part of the Marker Square Farmer's Market. A hub of activity on Saturday mornings, this would be the perfect place to engage citizens in sharing their history and capture the stories of long-time vendors. In the summer months, the stage area could be used. Have a simple large box with a hanger and table inside. There is a chair next to the box. A citizen could bring an item of clothing or artifact from their family and have 5 minutes to

tell a short story relating to its Alexandria history (participants would be vetted in advance) this would be a great way to promote the oral history program and determine candidates to be taped. The creation of a new oral history program opens myriad opportunities to have the community embrace this project and to see the value for future generations, including adding oral histories to the many walking tours the Office of Historic Alexandria offers the public.

The following is a summary of the costs associated with this expansion.

Expense	Expense	Annual or One-time
Full-time Research Historian	\$ 90,159.00	Annual
Part-time Museum Aide II (seasonal) 8 hrs/wk	\$ 8,858.00	Annual
Travel	\$ 1,000.00	Annual
Final Cut Pro X editing software	\$ 300.00	Annual
Dropbox Subscription to facilitate uploading	\$ 240.00	Annual
Transcriptions	\$ 3,200.00	Annual
Public Outreach	\$ 800.00	Annual
Annual Equipment and Software Maintenance and upgrades	\$ 1,000.00	Annual
Camera	\$ 1,200.00	One-Time
Tripod	\$ 200.00	One-Time
Portable Lights	\$ 100.00	One-Time
Wireless Microphone	\$ 275.00	One-Time
SD Cards for Camera	\$ 500.00	One-Time
Converter from Cassette to Digital	\$ 50.00	One-Time
Budget for first year	\$ 106,882.00	
Annual Budget	\$ 105,557.00	

Current Oral History Program

Oral histories record and therefore, preserve memories, reflections, and thoughts of living people about their past experiences. According to the Oral History Association, a membership organization for all persons interested in oral history, “Oral history is both the oldest type of historical inquiry, predating the written word, and one of the most modern, initiated with tape recorders in the 1940s and now using 21st-century digital technologies.”

Alexandria Legacies, the Alexandria Oral History Program, was developed through the City of Alexandria’s Office of Historic Alexandria (OHA) in the early 1980s. Since then, OHA has collected oral histories of long-time Alexandria residents. The Oral history program was expanded in 2005, and volunteers are actively conducting interviews and preparing transcriptions. A grant from the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities supported oral history interviews with those representing different ethnic groups in the post-1970 immigrant communities of Alexandria. This is part of a multi-year project entitled *Immigration Alexandria: Past, Present, and Future*.

Currently, over 110 transcribed oral histories are available on OHA’s website. Oral Histories are indexed by name, neighborhood, and subject. Subjects include The African American Community, Education, Potomac Yard, Living Legends of Alexandria, Historic Preservation, Civic Leaders, etc.

At this time, the oral history program has a part-time, eight hour a week staff person who is partially dedicated to overseeing the program, trains volunteers (10 currently active), and coordinates taking, transcribing, and finalizing oral histories with those in the community. The Oral History team currently posts 4 to 6 interviews a year, with the average time to complete an interview from start to finish measuring 5 to 6 months. OHA has a backlog of dozens of oral histories that need transcription.

Future Oral History Program

An expanded Oral History Program would require major expenditures. Primary would be the hiring of a full-time research historian to coordinate the program. They would be responsible for converting interviews that were recorded on cassette tape into digital formats, scheduling interviews, training volunteers, keeping and maintaining the inventory of equipment, reaching out to potential interviewees, maintaining a transcription schedule, coordinating with a transcription company, and archiving the completed interviews. The Oral History Research Historian would also need to regularly go to conferences on oral history, in order to stay abreast of new developments in the field.

An expanded Oral History Program would also require new and updated equipment. The program would need a new camera, tripod, portable lights, a device to convert cassette tape into digital formats, a wireless microphone, memory cards for the camera, an editing software

program, and a DropBox business account to facilitate moving the data from the camera to the new digital storage space which ITS has indicated to OHA it can accommodate. It would regularly send the interviews to a transcription company, which charges approximately \$160 per hour of recorded footage.

If OHA had the funding to do this, a realistic goal would be 25 interviews a year, up from 4-6. Many of the delays are on the back end of the process, whether it be transcribing the interview, or the interviewee being slow to return their edits to OHA. As a means of comparison, the Northern Virginia Oral History project collected 295 oral history interviews between 1958 and 1990, an average of fewer than 10 interviews a year.

Expanding the Reach and Potential of Oral History

Oral history programs must constantly strive to demonstrate their importance to the community and to future historians, residents, and City staff who will continue to learn from these insights for generations to come. The expanded *Alexandria Legacies* oral history initiative, through proactive programs and projects, would spark community engagement and become a more visible history element, one that challenges the old vision of oral history – dusty audio tapes locked away in a historian's attic.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 12, 2020

Question:

How many streets in Alexandria are named after Confederate generals, soldiers or political figures, and what would it cost to rename each one?

Response:

The Ad Hoc Advisory Group on Confederate Memorials and Street Names was provided an updated list of Confederate Streets (attachment 1 prepared by the City's Office of Historic Alexandria) in February 2016. There are 61 streets in Alexandria named after Confederate generals, soldiers or political figures. The estimated costs to replace confederate street signage and IT related changes based on this 2016 list is broken up into "Confederate Namesakes" (Page 1-2) and "Possible Confederate Namesakes" (Page 3-4). The estimated costs to replace publicly maintained signage associated with the 31 "Confederate Namesakes" is \$186,000. The estimated costs to replace publicly maintained signage associated with the 30 "Possible Confederate Namesakes" is \$88,750. The estimated grand total for signage replacement and IT related changes if both namesakes and possible namesakes are replaced is \$274,750. This cost includes contracted labor needed to update various IT systems (such as CAD, GIS, Finance) and to communicate and coordinate these changes with various City and regional entities. No additional IT equipment costs would be expected. The Department of Emergency Communications does not anticipate additional costs since ITS will update the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.

It is important to note that residents and businesses may incur costs (updated signage, websites, print materials, etc.) due to the renaming of streets. In addition, there would be staff time to manage the process of changing street names, in particular determining the replacement names.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 16, 2020

Question:

What would it cost to add glass recycling at the farmer's markets?

Response:

Staff has evaluated the collection of glass at the farmer's markets as part of the existing food waste and compost program. Due to the dense and crowded nature of farmer's markets, staff are concerned with safety and liability. When glass is accidentally dropped and shattered, there may be issues of broken shards injuring people or dogs walking in tight areas. The composting program at the farmer's markets has increased by nearly 100% from year one to year five. The footprint required for the food waste carts has grown, and staff anticipates that it may expand even further as the awareness and popularity of the composting program grows. The growth of this program directly impacts the ability to expand other program in the current space. Given these circumstances, staff does not recommend collecting glass at farmer's markets in conjunction with the composting program at this time.

In order to achieve glass recycling in conjunction with farmers market, the City could purchase o a dedicated glass collection trailer and run a pilot program. The trailer could move between all City farmer's markets and be used for other special events like Earth Day. The trailer costs about \$30,000 and could hold up to 5 tons of glass. Glass collection may be possible at the markets if enough parking space can be secured for the trailer which is currently a first-come first-served model for the vendors at the markets. This trailer and truck would require approximately 45 feet by 8 feet of parking space.

Staff recommends the trailer to be staffed, so someone is on hand to sweep and dispose of any broken glass during drop-off hours. For the pilot program, staff recommends starting with one trailer for a short period of time to evaluate the effectiveness of this model of glass collection prior to purchasing additional assets. Since the trailer is more mobile than a 40-yard purple bin, the City may consider piloting the collection at other locations as well. Staff notes that because the trailer option is smaller than a 40-yard bin, it would require more frequent dumping with the processor, requiring additional truck emissions.

A grant opportunity may also be available to cover the cost of the trailer. Staff will evaluate this grant opportunity and, if feasible, bring to Council for consideration later this year. Given that the grant would only cover the cost of the trailer, additional funding for labor and operations would still be required in order to launch a pilot.

Below is a table showing the total estimated cost of operating one trailer for year 1 and year 2.

	Estimated Cost for 1 Trailer
Trailer	\$ 30,000
Overtime costs (1 FTE covering one Saturday and one Sunday market for 52 weeks)	\$ 41,600
Fuel (35 miles round trip = 1 trip per weekend)	\$ 500
Fleet Maintenance	\$ 1,000
Total Year 1 Cost (capital + labor)	\$ 73,100
Total Year 2 Cost (Annual costs)	\$ 43,100

For comparison, the annual cost for the current purple bin program with 5 bins is \$40,000. It costs \$8,000 to operate one purple roll-off bin per year versus \$43,100 for a trailer after equipment is paid off.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 13, 2020

Question: What are other local jurisdictions providing to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Agricultural Task Force proposal?

Response:

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG), through support from philanthropy, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and COG's Department of the Environmental Programs, launched a Regional Food Systems Program in 2016 to build stronger connections within the region's food and farm economy. This expanded on past work of COG's Regional Agricultural Workgroup to bring together technical assistance providers to raise awareness about the unique value that farms and farmland provide to Greater Washington.

The Agricultural Task Force, co-chaired by Councilmember Craig Rice (Montgomery County, MD) and Councilmember Jon Stehle (City of Fairfax, VA), was established in 2019. This group is comprised of elected official members of COG's Chesapeake Bay and Water Resources Policy Committee (CBPC). They propose creating a 10-year Regional Food and Agriculture Economy Commission that will be comprised of elected officials, business, and community stakeholders and physically located at COG.

Recently, several Agricultural Task Force members highlighted that the COVID-19 crisis has affirmed the need to plan locally and regionally for food system resiliency. The Agricultural Task Force is moving forward with its funding requests understanding that local budgets are in flux. The FY 2021 budget will support completion of the near-term deliverables using one FTE position at COG to serve as the Regional Food Systems Value Chain Coordinator, management oversight and support, one part-time Intern, and limited meeting and project expenses. The projected budget is anticipated to come from three sources: Philanthropic partners (\$60,000), COG Department of Environmental Programs (\$25,000) and jurisdictional contributions (\$165,000). Suggested support for this initiative could be realized with funding from a handful of COG jurisdictions providing an amount of \$10,000 to \$25,000 annually.

The City of Alexandria staff did not receive a funding request from COG for the FY 2021 Proposed Budget; however, COG has received pledges from elected leaders from neighboring jurisdictions including Fairfax County, Arlington County, Montgomery County, and the District of Columbia in the amount of \$25,000 each, as well as \$10,000 pledges from the City of Fairfax and the City of Falls Church. COG is also working with Loudoun County for a financial commitment.

For additional information about the work of the Agricultural Task Force, please review the [Regional Food Systems Program](#) on the MWCOG website and refer to the [What Our Region Grows](#) report. A draft Working Paper is available upon request. It includes insights from more than 40 regional leaders on the need for strategic regional planning for food and agriculture.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP Budget
Questions & Answers

April 15, 2020

Question: Can you please provide an update of the FY 2020 Budget Question 11, Reduction Proposals Not Taken? (Councilman Chapman and Mayor Wilson)

Response: Early in the FY 2021 budget development process, staff estimated a \$10 to \$20 million budget shortfall due to slow revenue growth and high-demand expenditure needs, particularly in the areas of schools operating, Metro operating and capital costs, and City and school capital infrastructure needs.

To address this shortfall, the City Manager and the Office of Management and Budget instructed departments to develop expenditure reduction options equal to or greater than 2.5% of FY 2020 General Fund budgets. This exercise requested \$8.7 million in expenditure reduction options or revenue increases to be submitted from departments. A total of \$5.7 million of submitted reductions, efficiencies and cost recovery options were taken. The attached list includes \$3.5 million in reduction options that were considered but not included in the FY 2021 Proposed Budget.

All reduction proposals were reviewed by the Office of Management & Budget and prioritized by Focus Area groups. In many cases, the items on this list were not selected because they represent priority programs or services or if the reductions were taken would provide significant service reductions to the community or increase pressures on other City services.

Attachment 1: FY 2021 Proposed Budget – Reductions not Taken

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP Budget
Questions & Answers

March 23, 2020

Question:

Please provide Council a list of departmental supplemental requests not funded in the FY 2021 Proposed Budget (Councilman Aguirre).

Response:

As part of the FY 2021 budget development process, the City Manager and the Office of Management and Budget instructed departments to develop expenditure reduction options equal to or greater than 2.5% of FY 2020 General Fund budgets as well as to submit supplemental requests that aligned with City and department priorities. This exercise resulted in the submission of over \$13 million in supplemental requests from departments.

All supplemental proposals were reviewed by the Office of Management & Budget and prioritized by Focus Area groups. Supplementals were funded based on the results of prioritization and in alignment with the City's smart, green, and equitable initiatives. The items listed on Attachment 1 were not selected due to the limited availability of resources. The listed expenditure and revenue costs represent initial cost estimates that would have been further analyzed and refined if selected for funding.

Attachment 1: FY 2021 Proposed Budget – Supplementals Not Funded

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

Question:

What is the cost if the retroactive application of the current promotional rule was applied to all eligible employees?

Response:

The cost to apply the current promotional rule to all eligible employees using the Years of Service Adjustment Model (YOSAM) is estimated to be at least \$3.7 million. The table below outlines the minimum cost by pay scale.

Employee Group	# of Employees	Salary Increase	Benefit Increase	Total Increase
FMME	33	\$113,679	\$40,413	\$154,092
GENS	825	1,801,500	403,973	2,205,472
GSNV	125	158,332	21,186	179,518
PSFI	118	413,453	214,642	628,095
PSPO	190	233,445	121,192	354,637
PSSH	91	130,317	59,399	189,716
Grand Total	1,382	\$2,850,725	\$860,804	\$3,711,529

The cost to apply the current promotional rule is most likely significantly higher due to the fact that it was not possible to account for each employee’s step at the time of hire as this information is not readily available for analysis and would be needed in order to provide a more accurate estimate. As such, YOSAM was applied assuming that all employees started at step 0 (zero) on their respective pay scales, which is not a practice that is applied universally in the City.

In addition to challenges in creating a more accurate estimate for the cost to apply the promotion policy to all employees retroactively, this application of the promotion policy assumes that the steps on the City’s pay scales are reflective of each employee’s years of service in the City; this is not how the City’s promotion policy is defined. The promotion policy states that employees are “placed on the pay grade associated with their new job classification *on the step held prior to promotion unless the increase exceeds 20%*”; this is not the same as being assigned to the step that correlates with an employee’s years of service.

It is also important to note that in FY 2016, the HR Department shared a series of considerations when using the YOSAM model:

1. Previous Pay Policies

The YOSAM was developed in response to the Public Safety Work Group’s concern over what they considered to be pay alignment issues resulting from the City’s previous pay practices. It is important to note that these pay practices were not exclusively applied to the Public Safety Work Group but they were also applied to employees on the General Scale. While the Public Safety Group feels that the

City's previous pay policies were erroneous, the City has never explicitly stated that it agrees with this position. However, the application of the YOSAM potentially would support this position. The City Manager does not support implementation of YOSAM.

2. Retroactive Exposure

The YOSAM is designed as a retroactive pay adjustment over the last 30 years. As such, the City should seriously consider the inherent impact of applying retroactive pay adjustments such as:

- a. Impact to any overtime pay
- b. Impact to retirement plan costs

If YOSAM is applied, these matters should be reviewed from a legal point of view and there should be clarity in how these potential effects will be addressed.

3. Years of Service vs. Years of Experience

As the name implies, the YOSAM takes into account an employee's years of service. This could create an internal pay equity issue for employees who have several years of experience with the City but is new to their current job. For example, while an employee may have 15 years of service with the City, they could be in their current job for only 3 years. If that employee is at a Step 10, they would be moved to a Step 15. There could be a number of scenarios why this may not be appropriate such as they were recently promoted into a managerial position with very little management experience. Comparing this employee to an employee in the same or similar job who is at a step 15 and who has 15 years of direct management experience, this would create an internal pay inequity.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 16, 2020

Question

What are the total number of fire calls compared to our comparators? What are the number of emergency medical calls compared to our comparators? (Councilman Seifeldein)

Background

In response to a question from Councilman Seifeldein concerning the total number of fire and emergency medical calls compared to our comparators, the following information is provided:

Jurisdiction Comparison

Alexandria, Arlington & Fairfax use the same ambulance billing vendor to assist with collection. The data from the three jurisdictions is below with regards to EMS transports:

Jurisdiction	Total EMS Transports	Advanced Life Support Calls	Basic Life Support Calls	Time Period
Alexandria	8,162	4,587	3,575	Calendar 2019
Arlington	9,804	6,996	2,808	Fiscal 2019
Fairfax County	54,901	43,825	11,076	Calendar 2019

The number of Fire vs EMS calls is shown in the chart below:

Jurisdiction	EMS Incidents	Fire Incidents	Source/Time Period
Alexandria	10,034	5,864	FY 19 NFIRS*
Arlington	15,168	6,929	FY 19 NFIRS*
Fairfax County	75,123	20,369	FY 18 Annual Report

*The NFIRS stands for National Fire Incident Reporting System which categorizes calls based on findings of the calls (not dispatches). Fire Incidents do not include calls from the “good intent” series.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 11, 2020

Question: What is the Admissions tax? Who contributes to this revenue source? If changes were requested, what steps are necessary to update this item?

Response:

To be passed with budget adoption, fee changes that require an ordinance should be docketed for the April 14th City Council legislative meeting, followed by the Public Hearing on April 18th and final passage on April 29th. In order to ensure these changes are included on the April 14 docket, Council members considering add/delete items that would require an ordinance provide advance notification no later than April 6th. The add/delete proposal itself would not be due until April 16th. Fees that require an ordinance that do not meet the deadlines for these dates would have to be docketed post-budget adoption at the May legislative meetings, and the budget would have to be adopted without the certainty of the ordinance's passage. City staff recommends no change to this rate.

As part of the FY 2006 Budget Adoption (May 2005), the City established an Admissions Tax of ten percent of any admission charged, not to exceed \$0.50 per person (Title 3, Chapter 2, Article W of the Code of Virginia). The tax is imposed on admission charges for events occurring within the City. An event is any amusement, entertainment, performance, exhibition or production open to the general public. Examples of events include movies, theatre productions, musical events or concerts, amusement attractions, circuses, carnivals, as well as lectures, readings or symposia.

The City is granted the authority under its Charter, and pursuant to Va. Code § 58.1-3840; however, the City's Admission tax must conform to the classifications of taxable events as defined in the Virginia Code (Va. Code § 58.1-3817). The City currently has no ability to craft other exemptions or classifications. In 1999, the City's Legislative Package included an attempt to establish the designation of motion pictures played in theaters as a separate class of events. This was not approved. There is no State maximum on the amount the City can charge for the Admissions Tax.

The Code of Virginia categorizes admissions in six distinct categories, and the Admissions Tax must be applied at the same rate to all Admissions within single categories. Localities are permitted to differentiate the rate by category. In Alexandria, the Admissions tax is only applied to the last category. All others are excluded by City Code. The exact State Code language is reflected here:

- 1) Admissions charged for attendance at any event, the *gross* receipts of which go wholly to charitable purpose or purposes.
- 2) Admissions charged for attendance at public and private elementary, secondary, and college school-sponsored events, including events sponsored by school-recognized student organizations.
- 3) Admissions charged for entry into museums, botanical or similar gardens, and zoos.

- 4) Admissions charged to participants in order to participate in sporting events.
- 5) Admissions charged for entry into major league baseball games and events at any major league baseball stadium which has seating for at least 40,000 persons.
- 6) All other admissions

Current FY 2020 projected revenue is \$0.5 million and FY 2021 estimated revenue is projected to remain flat at \$0.5 million. An increase to the current Admissions Tax rate would require an ordinance to amend Section 3-2-383 of Title 3, Article W of Article R of the Code of the City of Alexandria. Fee related ordinance changes require a first reading and a public hearing prior to a final vote and adoption.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

May 1, 2020

Question:

What would be the cost and benefits associated with creating a multi-lingual office or division of immigration affairs? (Councilman Aguirre)

Response:

The City of Alexandria started a Multi-cultural Services Initiative in 2001/2002 that was housed in the Department of Human Services (now DCHS). The focus at the time was on building relationships between the City of Alexandria and the residents of the Arlandria community. It was initially staffed with one person titled Multi-cultural Services Coordinator (MSC). Staff attended regular community events and offered outreach and education on all City services. Additionally, the staff person assumed supervision over the Hispanic Education and Outreach Program (HEOP) that provided ELL and other - acculturation classes to approximately 400 adult participants annually. The MSC also ensured all City departments had Language Access Plans that complied with Title VI. In 2009, during the recession, the HEOP program was cut out of the budget. The MSC position was never restored in DCHS.

The Race and Social Equity Officer position in the City Manager's office approved in the FY 2020 budget was recently filled as of February 10, 2020. The focus of this position is to advance race and social equity plans within City departments, conduct community outreach and build relationships with our black and immigrant communities. The goal is to review policies with a racial and social lens to make sure there are no deleterious impacts on Alexandria residents and to ensure current policies are revisited regularly to ensure all Alexandria residents are treated equitably. The benefits of engaging with our under-served communities will be in gathering more diversity of thought around policies that impact land use, transportation, affordable housing, the justice system, public and child welfare and many more. Although the initial cost is based on having one FTE, if the scope expands it may require proposing additional staff in the future. If there was interest in establishing one-to-one outreach with individual and facilitating connection to services meeting their needs, then additional staffing would need to be considered. It is estimated that each additional position related to this effort would cost approximately \$93,200 annually (salary and benefits) based on job specifications and duties.

City of Alexandria, Virginia

FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP

Budget Questions & Answers

March 23, 2020

Question: Could the City create a First Source Hiring program in the City and what would that program cost? (Mayor Wilson and Vice Mayor Bennett-Parker)

Response: In response to a memo (attached) from Mayor Wilson and Vice-Mayor Bennett-Parker concerning their advocacy for the City creating a First Source hiring program, the following information is provided:

Background: A First Source hiring program would require City contractors who are located in the Washington Metropolitan area to give consideration to hiring City residents through a process that would be managed largely by the DCHS Workforce Development Center (WDC). The Federal government and some other localities in the US have such a program in place. The City has the authority to make the utilization of a First Source program a mandatory contract condition when it issues RFP's or other bid solicitation documents. The type of contract (professional service, construction, trades services, etc.) can be defined by the City, as well as the dollar threshold for which a First Source program would be a contract condition. If enacted, it would be recommended that First Source be phased in to get the program set up appropriately and therefore implemented successfully. The program would not apply to the purchase of commodities, equipment, small purchases and contracts, or for contractors whose hiring would be based in the D.C. area.

Process: If a First Source hiring program is funded, the City of Alexandria Workforce Development Center (WDC) would serve as the primary intermediary between job seekers and contractors, as well as pertinent City agencies that issue contracts. WDC estimates that it will need one First Source Hire Specialist (FSHS) in order to successfully execute these new responsibilities. The position classification would be Employment & Training Specialists (ETS) Grade 14. Annual salary is estimated at \$59,660 (\$85,000 including benefits).

Once a contractor is awarded a contract with the City, the contractor would have a predetermined period within which to submit its hiring plan to the FSHS. The FSHS would provide orientation to the contractor on how the First Source hiring process works including points of contact, reporting requirements, services available to businesses and job seekers as well as any other information that will help the contractor in the process.

The FSHS would provide resumes and other pertinent information to the Contractor's point of contact within a designated time. Depending on the need of the employer, the FSHS may also organize a customized hiring event for additional candidates in cases where specific skills are unavailable within the First Source Hire Registry. The FSHS would actively work throughout the process to ensure qualifying residents are matched with the list of vacancies posted by the contractor. In certain situations, supportive and retention services could be provided for candidates referred by WDC based on need.

The FSHS would continue to work with the contractors and the Procurement Office to ensure compliance with the First Source hiring program. In general, the FSHS responsibilities include but not limited to the following:

- Outreach to contractors who have been awarded a qualifying contract.
- Orientation, onboarding, training, problem resolving and retention services for both the business and the prospective job seekers.
- Consult with contractors for timely and accurate reporting for compliance with the First Source Hire program requirements.
- Maintain current database of candidates for First Source Hire opportunities; Review the registry on a regular basis and check in with candidates to make sure soft and hard skills gaps are addressed.
- Connect employers with an existing ready to work pipeline of talent graduating from WDC sponsored and other training programs.
- Plan, prepare and implement customized hiring events and advertise to attract a wide selection of viable candidates.
- Update WDC job board with First Source Hire job openings.
- Support the development of job specification and job description.
- Work with candidates that have not been offered the position or terminated to connect them with appropriate resources including skilling up, coaching and alternative placement.
- Stay connected and be an active part of formal and informal networks of referral for employment.
- Identify opportunities such as training needs, feedback loop from prospectus.

Cost: DCHS has determined that the cost to administer this program would be \$85,000 per year as it would require the addition of one Employment and Training Specialist to the WDC. This new position is not funded in the FY 2021 Proposed Budget. A part-time position would not be sufficient to manage the program appropriately according to DCHS. Based on the outcomes reported by the DC government's First Source hiring program, for each \$10 million in First Source required contracts the hiring total of City residents would be approximately 45 residents hired. In 2019, the City issued about \$20 million for 29 competitively bid contracts with a value of \$100,000 or more. 24 of those 29 contracts were between \$100,000 and \$500,000 in value. If Council funds and approves a First Source hiring program, staff would establish the processes needed implement the program that includes a phase in period.

Attachment 1: First Source Hiring Memo from Mayor and Vice Mayor

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

Question: Where and when will the expanded summer learning and full-day Pre-K included in the FY 2021 proposed budget be offered, and what number and percentage of Head Start students will benefit from expanded summer learning?

Response:

Overview:

The FY 2021 increased funding totaling \$505,500 will expand capacity across four (4) early childhood providers (The Campagna Center, Child and Family Network Centers (CFNC), ALIVE!, and Creative Play School) to support school readiness and address service gaps in full-day and summer learning opportunities. Funding streams supporting the students include: Head Start, Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI), local funding, and private dollars. The City Manager's FY 2021 budget funds 100% of the expanded summer learning and full-day Pre-Kindergarten (Pre-K) that early childhood providers felt they could implement successfully for FY 2021.

Program Locations:

Partners operate throughout the City but are increasingly focusing on classrooms and programming on the West End given the growing population of young children there. This increased funding will permit expansion of key services across the City. The West End will be a focus given child data and providers' interest in offering services in locations convenient to families.

Head Start/Full Day Pre-K Funding:

A pilot was conducted at John Adams last year in response to the need for after school programming for Head Start and VPI students served at the Early Childhood Center at John Adams. FY 2021 Full-Day Pre-K funding will permit the pilot to continue and expand at John Adams and expand to Jefferson Houston to serve an estimated 45 Head Start students between the two sites. Total Head Start need for after school programming was calculated to be 119 families based on family profiles for the FY 2020 school year, so this funding makes significant progress on meeting that need.

In addition to the 45 Head Start students, the Full-Day Pre-K funding will also support afterschool programming for 64 VPI and at-risk students, spread across the partner providers, adding up to 109 in total. DCHS and the partner programs will coordinate on a process to ensure that the expanded funding is allocated appropriately across programs and locations, based on family need and provider capacity.

Head Start/Expanded Summer Learning:

A portion of the one-time FY 2020 additional early childhood funding enabled providers to serve 59 students. FY 2021 funding supports expansion of Summer Learning to 96 students, who will be a mix of

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

VPI, Head Start, and Alexandria's locally defined at-risk students. The Campagna Center will have capacity through its Early Learning Center at St. James and within its summer Campagna Kids programs for those children who are transitioning to kindergarten in the fall, 34 seats in total.

In addition to those 34 seats, this increased funding supports 62 more seats for summer learning at partner programs. Again, the following breakdown is preliminary based on provider estimates, but the 62 would potentially be spread among other partners as follows: ALIVE – 18 students; Creative Play School – 10 students; CFNC – 34 students, at locations across the City.

Number/Percentage Goal Details:

For Summer Learning, FY 2021 funding supports 96 students, which significantly expands the FY 2020 pilot that served 59 students. Over FY 2022 and FY 2023, further expansion is estimated to a total of 122 students should funding become available. For FY 2021, 96 students meet 100% of the expansion goal for the fiscal year. With funding, expansion goals through FY 2023 are projected to hit 100% of targets that reflect the capacity of current providers. This would constitute a major leap forward and profoundly change how Alexandria can deliver needed early childhood services.

For Full Day/Extended Day, FY 2021 funding supports 109 students, which is very significant as programs can now commit to families that they can access full day Pre-K. Previously programs would cobble together what they could, but family demand outstripped capacity. Expanding from 109 students for FY 2021 to 200 students in FY 2023 would achieve 55% for FY 2021 and 100% for FY 2023. But again, 109 for FY 2021 is 100% of the FY 2021 goal.

Dollars to Goal Details:

The dollar breakdown for additional investment to get to 100% for FY 2023 would be as follows:

- Summer Learning: FY 2021 funding of \$211,200 supporting 96 students; FY 2023 funding of \$268,400 supporting 122 students.
- Full Day/Extended Day: FY 2021 funding of \$294,300 supporting 109 students; FY 2023 funding of \$540,000 supporting 200 students.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 21, 2020

Question

What percent of total ambulance billing revenue comes from insurance companies? What are neighboring jurisdictions doing in terms of cost recovery and collections practices for ambulance billing? (Mayor Wilson)

Response

In response to questions from Mayor Wilson concerning the percent of total ambulance billing revenues paid by insurance companies, and what neighboring jurisdictions are doing in terms of cost recovery and collection practices, the following information is provided.

Cost Recovery - The chart below shows the percentage and source of ambulance billing revenue received in calendar year 2019.

Self-pay	32.25%
Medicare	33.25%
Medicaid	7.00%
Private Insurance	26.75%
Workers Compensation	0.50%

Medicare has a capped rate of \$232 (not including mileage costs) for all transports, meaning they will only reimburse that amount per transport regardless of the actual cost to transport.

The Collection Process - The Alexandria Fire Department (AFD) maintains a soft-billing approach by which an individual is sent three unpaid bill notices in the mail. If the collection attempt is unsuccessful after the third notice or 180 days after the date of the initial claim, invoice, or bill, the account is written off. AFD does not currently send unpaid ambulance transport bills to collections for further action.

Fairfax County, Arlington County, Prince William County, & Loudoun County also maintain a soft billing approach. Arlington County does send delinquent accounts to the Treasurer's Office for further review and action. The Arlington Treasurer's Office might make additional attempts to send delinquent notices or to contact individuals with unpaid bills for payment. Accounts with unresolved unpaid balances are written off. Arlington does not send unpaid bills to collections for further action. This practice is commonly known across multiple jurisdictions as a "compassionate" or a "soft" billing policy.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 14, 2020

Question: Please provide the impact of the WayFair sales tax dollars.

Response:

Based on the methodologies discussed below, staff estimates that the revenue gain to the City in FY 2020 from the Wayfair Supreme Court decision ranges from \$0.4 million to \$1.2 million through February 2020. Pursuant to state legislation adopted during the 2019 session of the General Assembly, “remote marketplace sellers” like Wayfair are now subject to state and local sales tax. This legislation resulted from a 2018 US Supreme Court decision in *South Dakota v. Wayfair, Inc.* that held that states may charge sales tax on purchases made from out-of-state sellers, even if the seller does not have a physical presence in the state.

The Virginia Department of Taxation reported that it is currently unable to quantify how much of the local sales tax revenue is attributable to this state code change. Similarly, specific company receipts provided on reports to the locality also do not identify the nature of sale (i.e., whether or not it was an Internet sale absent physical presence in the locality). The state reports also do not provide separate business names location in state sales tax reports. While some conjecture can be made based on the name of the business, many others use corporate names not typically associated with the more familiar business trade name. Absent this specific identifying information and given the volume of data, staff can only make an educated rough estimate as to the range of impact of Wayfair on local revenue based on the two methodologies noted below:

1. Staff matched the monthly sales tax reports against the local BPOL tax roll based on FEIN or Social Security numbers. By identifying those businesses that did not have a corresponding local license (i.e., no physical presence in the locality), staff identified a \$411,000 increase in sales tax revenue year-to-date, or \$41.1 million in new taxable sales.
2. Alternatively, noting that state sales tax revenue has increased, the state reported that “this is directly related to the anticipated increase in Wayfair related revenues”¹ and that “new use tax dealers submitted \$26.4 million for the month of September.”¹ Inasmuch as Alexandria’s local sales tax revenue represents 0.786% of total state General Fund sales tax, this would equate to almost \$208,000 in City revenue for the month of September. Multiplying that by 6 months, beginning in September 2019, yields approximately \$1.2 million to date through February (the law went into effect July 1, which means the gain would not start showing up until September 2019 receipts, due to the lag in state collections and remitting). This would equate to \$120 million in new taxable sales.

1 Layne Jr., A.L. (2019). [*Economic and Revenue Update: A Briefing for the Money Committees.*](#) Commonwealth of Virginia.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 9, 2020

Question: Please provide any budget comments and feedback received online prior to the release of the Proposed Budget.

Response: After the November 2019 City Council Retreat, the Office of Management & Budget provide an online link to collect any budget feedback, suggestions or comments for the upcoming budget. In total, four responses were received and are provided below.

Comment #1

The budget needs to fully fund all of the Environmental Action Plan short-term actions that are scheduled for FY2021. The City Council approved the EAP this past summer and a Climate Emergency resolution last month. Accordingly, the budget needs to implement the City government's stated objectives to shift to clean energy and mitigate catastrophic climate change.

Comment #2

Give Firefighters a raise!

Comment #3

I'm writing to ask that you prioritize the Holmes Run Trail reconstruction in the FY21 budget. I understand that on the current schedule it won't be done until 2023. I also understand that the estimated cost is \$6M. This trail is a very popular path for families, bikers, runners and walkers. It was closed for a long time to build a bridge across Holmes Run - twice - because of engineering reasons, and then shortly after opening - it was closed again due to flooding.

My neighborhood uses this trail for transportation and recreation. I can't understand why you would prioritize controversial bike lanes, that aren't being used, elsewhere in the City, but wait years before fixing a well used, well loved path. If you're serious about promoting biking, and car alternatives, you would prioritize this trail - which connects Alexandria to major commuting paths. Please reconsider, and add funding to the FY21 budget for this trail to be fixed.

Comment #4

Please add funding back in to restart curbside glass recycling collection. This new program will save funds but result in far more glass ending up in landfills due the program's inconvenience for residents. I strongly support you all but am very disappointed in this decision.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 9, 2020

Question: Please provide any online comments regarding the City Manager's Proposed Budget.

Response: The following budget comments were submitted online from February 20, 2020 through March 4, 2020 at 5pm.

Comment #1

Lots of spending. Where are the budget cuts? Surely not every single expense is absolutely necessary

Comment #2

Call taxes what they include in reality: taxes AND fees. (...and this applies to the State level folk also.) For too many of recent decades the City Councils have fudged reality by claiming "no tax increases" for too many cycles when in reality increased assessments values & rates and an increasing number of specific item fees covered the Councils' projects & rising budgets. Figure folks know when there can be "no free lunch" if certain types and levels of service are needed. But, at least be honest with making one full TAX payment system cover all the bills. All the longstanding "double-speak" does is persuade most with a "half a brain" that we must be viewed as too stupid to notice. And that disrespect flows back upstream. I can also attest that in my small community where almost every major City service cost was proffered out with the original developer, we get minimal return on our tax & fee contributions. We are Cash Cows...and after 35 years, it's become a bit irritating, both as an individual homeowner and as a longtime member of this small community's board of directors. Thank you.

Comment #3

I am an Alexandria resident who is lucky enough to live in a nice but by no means opulent single family home. Every year the property tax rate goes up substantially, far more than the inflation rate. I have a full time job and 40% of my after tax income goes to pay for property taxes in the city. This is not sustainable. Please consider that you are pricing people out of the city.

Comment #4

I am requesting that a year-round staffed composting station be placed on the City's West End. Currently, there is a very popular composting program during the summer months at the Ben Brenman Park Market but during the winter months, residents on the West End must drive to the Old town Market or to the Mount Vernon Market to take food waste. In my opinion, the carbon foot print does not add value to Alexandria as an eco-friendly city. The glass recycling on the West End is greatly appreciated. Should you include composting on the West End as well, residents will be most appreciative. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Comment #5

While reading about the proposed budget, I noted the following; " \$100,000 is proposed to be allocated for the creation of a due process universal representation access program for immigrants facing deportation." There are better ways to spend the taxpayers money on. Education, road repair, health insurance for city employees, etc. Let those who made a choice to break laws pay their own legal costs.

Comment #6

I feel the 2-cent increase in the tax rate will be crippling to my hard working family in a year when property values have increase so much already. This tax would make living in Alexandria on a single household income nearly impossible and is excessive for a city that is booming in so many other ways. Please reconsider this proposal. It will place unnecessary harm on many working families that are just getting by.

Comment #7

I do NOT support the increase of the property tax rate given the large increase in property values this year. Our very small house increased 16% in value in just a single year! We can't afford the increased rate on top of that. Plus the increases in other fees--stormwater, refuge. You're pricing first time home buyers like us out of Old Town. We can't keep up.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 8, 2020

Question:

Please provide an update of the "Park Alexandria" program from FY 2008 with current fiscal impacts.

Response:

In 1993, in conjunction with the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce, the City initiated "Park Alexandria" which offered the employees of local Old Town restaurants and retail stores parking in the Courthouse Garage for \$1.00 in the evenings and on weekends in an effort to deter them from parking their personal vehicles on the street. The owners/managers of each business were provided a stamp to validate their employees' parking tickets which would provide for \$1.00 parking at the Courthouse. The use of this program was discontinued by all restaurants and retail businesses in Old Town by FY 2017, so the City discontinued the program.

The "Park Alexandria" program was funded through fees paid to the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce and operated by Visit Alexandria. Transportation & Environmental Services currently funds other parking initiatives in the budget. T&ES cooperates with Visit Alexandria on parking initiatives and provides some parking on holidays (i.e. free parking on Black Friday).

Similar to the Park Alexandria program, the City currently offers employees of Old Town businesses discounted parking in the evenings and weekends through the Discount Parking Program for Employees of Old Town Businesses which started in May 2018. Under this program, employees of approved businesses can park for a \$1 flat rate at the Market Square and Courthouse garages when parking after 4PM Monday through Friday and anytime on weekends and holidays. This is a \$4 discount compared to the usual \$5 max rate during these hours. 24 businesses are currently participating in the program. The current fiscal impact of this program is approximately \$4,500 in discounts provided per month; however, this does not necessarily translate to a \$4,500 loss in revenue since many of the employees who use this program would not park in City garages if the program did not exist. There is generally capacity in the garages during these times, so this does not prevent other parkers who would pay the full price from parking.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

April 15, 2020

Question: Provide an update of the "Gridlock Reduction Program" FY 2009 memo with current fiscal impacts.

Response:

The cost to fully restore the Gridlock Reduction Intervention Program (GRIP) as previously implemented is approximately \$477,000 annually. In the past, GRIP consisted of seven posts at designated intersections being filled for 3.5 hours a day. These posts were filled by both Police Officers and Parking Enforcement Officer IIIs. In Fiscal year 2009, the cost to run the GRIP Program was approximately \$330,000. The program cost at that time was based on \$100,000 for Police Officer overtime, plus \$230,000 for five Parking Enforcement Officer III positions and two sedans. The increase in cost from FY 2009 to FY 2021 is attributed to rising staffing costs.

GRIP was established in FY 2001 to reduce rush hour traffic involving ten separate intersections. The GRIP program had a positive, but limited, effect on traffic flow, but it was eventually deactivated in FY 2010 due to a myriad of issues; many of which still exist today. These issues include:

Cost concerns -The projected costs are based on an overtime rate that is provided to the City & outside vendors for all Special Events/ Details. The current overtime rate is \$72 an hour plus the calculation for FICA. Overtime was calculated by averaging the Police Officer I rate and the Police Officer IV rate, resulting in a projected overtime rate of \$ 72 per hour. Based on historical data when GRIP was in place, tenured supervisors were the primary employees who staffed the posts. At \$72 per hour and the 7.65% for FICA, the total cost to fill seven posts for each weekday excluding weekends and holidays is \$476,635.

	FY 2020
# of Officers	7
Hours per day	3.5
Overtime rate per hour	72
* Days per year (excl. holidays & weekends)	251
Cost of FICA	\$33,871
Total Cost w/FICA	\$476,635

Number of days = 251 excludes weekends and holidays

Worker morale – Previously, Parking Enforcement Officers III (PEOs) were tasked with working on the GRIP detail alongside Police Officers and, as the years went on, these PEOs resigned or took voluntary demotions to avoid working on the GRIP program. They expressed that due to their lack of enforcement powers, they were routinely ignored by drivers and they felt it was unfair that officers were paid overtime to work the detail where the PEOs were working on their regular schedule. Due to vacancies in this senior rank, the PEO III position was eventually eliminated.

Staff concerns – If the GRIP detail was re-instated; APD’s recommendation is to operate the detail on a completely volunteer basis as an overtime detail. APD has worked to maintain current staffing levels; the number of officers required for their Patrol schedule would not allow for on-duty officers to fill the GRIP detail.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 16, 2020

Question:

What is the cost and listing of current vacant positions that have been vacant for over 12 months?

Response:

OMB generated a report to identify all City positions, regardless of funding source, that were vacant for 12 months or longer and reviewed permanent position vacancies as of February 26, 2020 for all City departments. Positions with the "State Employee" personnel status were excluded from the review since the City does not control that state hiring process. Departments with identified vacant positions of 12 months or longer were provided the vacancy data and asked to provide information on the current status of the positions. Base on the departmental responses, the current status of the vacant positions has been broadly categorized into the following:

- **In Recruitment** – Includes positions at various stages of active recruitment;
- **Not Recruiting – Reclassification** – Includes pending and planned reclassifications;
- **Not Recruiting – Reorganization** – Includes pending and planned reorganizations;
- **Other** – All other statuses that do not fall under the above categories.

A total of 74 positions with a total FTE count of 64.92 have been identified. The tables below present all identified vacancies by the reported vacancy status. The tables include information on each position's FY 2021 budgeted FTE level, employee group, total budgeted compensation including salaries and benefits, and funding source.

Table 1: Vacant Positions in Recruitment

Department	Position	Position Description	Group	FTE	Salary and	
					Benefits	Funding Source
CODE	3806	CODE INSPECTOR IV	GENS	1.00	\$ 100,859	Other Special Revenue
CODE	4136	CODE INSPECTOR I	GENS	1.00	\$ 81,749	Other Special Revenue
DCHS	3121	MGMT ANALYST III	GENS	1.00	\$ 120,497	General Fund
DCHS	3133	DPTY DIR OF COM & HS	EXEC	1.00	\$ 162,722	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3141	ASST DIR-AGE/ADLT SR	GENS	1.00	\$ 131,533	General Fund & Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3246	FISCAL ANALYST	GENS	1.00	\$ 82,206	General Fund & Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3374	CLIN PSYCHOLOGIST I	GSNV	1.00	\$ 105,790	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3445	HUMAN SRVC SPCL II	GENS	1.00	\$ 89,331	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3446	HUMAN SRVC SPCL II	GSNV	0.50	\$ 47,561	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3451	HUMAN SRVC SPCL II	GENS	1.00	\$ 89,331	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3525	RESIDENTIAL COUNSLR	GSNV	0.50	\$ 34,844	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3674	DIRECT SUPPORT TECH	GENS	1.00	\$ 72,883	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3689	IT SUPPORT ENG III	GENS	1.00	\$ 93,170	General Fund & Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3734	ADMIN SUPPORT II	GSNV	0.55	\$ 30,291	Fiscal Year Grants
DEC	1335	PS COMM OFFICER II	GENS	1.00	\$ 90,871	General Fund
DGS	2357	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	GENS	1.00	\$ 114,733	General Fund
FINANCE	1442	CONTRACT SPECLST II	GENS	1.00	\$ 105,252	General Fund & CIP
FINANCE	1444	APPRAISER	GENS	1.00	\$ 83,228	General Fund
HEALTH	2673	ENVR HLTH OUTRCH SP	GENS	1.00	\$ 72,456	General Fund
HEALTH	2677	COMMUNITY ED SPEC	GENS	1.00	\$ 72,456	General Fund
ITS	1101	COMP PRGM ANALYST IV	GENS	1.00	\$ 130,800	General Fund
ITS	1237	COMP PROG ANALYST II	GENS	1.00	\$ 114,733	General Fund
ITS	3991	IT SUPPORT ENG III	GENS	1.00	\$ 100,859	CIP
POLICE	1925	CRIME ANALYST	GENS	1.00	\$ 105,619	General Fund
POLICE	1983	CRIME ANALYST	GENS	1.00	\$ 61,972	General Fund
POLICE	1990	FLEET MAINT COOR	GENS	1.00	\$ 55,751	General Fund
RPCA	2943	HORTICULTURAL SUPERV	GENS	1.00	\$ 92,004	General Fund
RPCA	3110	RECREATION LEADER II	GSNV	0.80	\$ 34,784	General Fund
T&ES	2335	FLEET SERVICE TEC II	GENS	1.00	\$ 98,172	General Fund

Table 2: Vacant Positions with Pending and Planned Reclassification

Department	Position	Position Description	Group	FTE	Salary and Benefits	Funding Source
CODE	4014	ADMIN SUPPORT II	GENS	1.00	\$ 62,831	Other Special Revenue
DCHS	3158	FAMILY SRVS SPEC I	GENS	1.00	\$ 89,331	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3161	FAMILY SRVS SPEC I	GENS	1.00	\$ 89,331	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3414	ITS COORDINATOR	GENS	1.00	\$ 109,873	General Fund & Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3698	OUTREACH PREVEN SPEC	GENS	1.00	\$ 85,009	General Fund & Non-Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3708	CLIENT INTK SRVS WRK	GENS	1.00	\$ 62,775	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3709	CLIENT INTK SRVS WRK	GENS	1.00	\$ 62,775	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3714	ACCOUNT CLERK II	GENS	1.00	\$ 60,547	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3733	ADMIN SUPPORT II	GENS	1.00	\$ 58,445	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3756	PROGRAM AIDE	GSNV	0.50	\$ 27,309	Fiscal Year Grants
DCHS	3758	MANAGEMENT ANALYST I	GENS	1.00	\$ 92,994	Fiscal Year Grants
DEC	1288	COORDINATOR/ITS	GENS	1.00	\$ 109,873	General Fund
DPI	4135	DPTY DIR-PROJECT IMP	EXEC	1.00	\$ 199,651	CIP
FINANCE	1416	BUS PSNL PR TAX SPRV	GENS	1.00	\$ 98,410	General Fund
FIRE	2407	DPT FIRE MARSHAL I	FMME	1.00	\$ 95,507	General Fund
FIRE	2637	EMS SUPV-MEDIC III	FMME	1.00	\$ 91,575	General Fund
HEALTH	2672	ADMIN SUPPORT IV	GENS	1.00	\$ 67,585	General Fund
ITS	3778	ITS COORDINATOR	GENS	1.00	\$ 109,873	Other Special Revenue
ITS	4220	NETWORK ENGINEER III	GENS	1.00	\$ 130,800	CIP
POLICE	1979	SPCL POLICE OFFICER	GENS	1.00	\$ 61,972	General Fund
RPCA	3005	RECREATION LEADER I	GENS	0.75	\$ 39,189	General Fund
T&ES	1738	SURVEY INSTR OPER	GENS	1.00	\$ 81,749	Sanitary Sewer & Stormwater Utility SRFs

Table 3: Vacant Positions Part of Pending and Planned Reorganization

Department	Position	Position Description	Group	FTE	Salary and Benefits	Funding Source
OCPI	4101	DIGITAL CONTENT COOR	GENS	1.00	\$ 115,372	General Fund
OHA	2838	MUSEUM AIDE I	GSNV	0.30	\$ 19,000	General Fund
OHA	2843	MUSEUM AIDE I	GSNV	0.20	\$ 15,238	General Fund
OHA	2847	MUSEUM AIDE I	GSNV	0.10	\$ 11,674	General Fund
OHA	2865	ADMIN SUPPORT III	GSNV	0.42	\$ 27,289	General Fund
OHA	2872	CURATOR I	GSNV	0.75	\$ 54,467	Other Special Revenue
OHA	2880	DEP DIR/OHA	EXEC	1.00	\$ 196,465	General Fund
OHA	2882	CURATOR II	GENS	1.00	\$ 96,654	General Fund
OHA	2884	MUSEUM DIRECTOR	GENS	1.00	\$ 114,733	General Fund

**Table 4: Vacant Positions with Status Categorized as “Other”
(see explanation in the Vacancy Status column)**

Department	Position	Position Description	Group	FTE	Salary and Benefits	Funding Source	Vacancy Status
CODE	3785	PLANS EXAMINER IV	GENS	1.00	\$ 147,098	Other Special Revenue	Planned Summer 2020 Recruitment
DCHS	3227	REGISTERED NURSE	GSNV	0.10	\$ 14,853	Fiscal Year Grants	Funding Used for Temp and Overtime
DCHS	3770	CUSTODIAN	GENS	0.50	\$ 25,320	Fiscal Year Grants	Funding Used for Workshop Participants
DCHS	3771	CUSTODIAN	GENS	0.45	\$ 22,692	Fiscal Year Grants	Funding Used for Workshop Participants
DCHS	4250	ADMIN SUPPORT II	GSNV	0.50	\$ 28,218	Fiscal Year Grants	Grant Funding Ended
HEALTH	2681	HR TECHNICIAN I	GSNV	1.00	\$ 69,847	General Fund	Other – Utilizing Contract Staff
INTERNAL AUDIT	4238	INTERNAL AUDITOR II	GENS	1.00	\$ 109,873	General Fund	Utilizing Contractual Services
ITS	1252	IT PROG MGR	GENS	1.00	\$ 142,891	General Fund	Recent Reclassification
ITS	1275	IT PROG MGR	GENS	1.00	\$ 142,891	General Fund	Recent Reclassification
LIBRARY	2798	LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	GSNV	0.50	\$ 27,797	Library	Planned FY22 Reclassification
POLICE	1909	POLICE CAPTAIN	PSPO	1.00	\$ 139,013	General Fund	Recent Reclassification
POLICE	2257	PRK ENFORCE OFFCR II	GENS	1.00	\$ 57,634	General Fund	Career Ladder Position
POLICE	2264	PRK ENFORCE OFFCR II	GENS	1.00	\$ 57,634	General Fund	Career Ladder Position
RPCA	3103	THERAPEUT REC LEADER	GSNV	0.50	\$ 35,795	General Fund	Assessment to Convert to Full-Time

Glossary of Department Name Abbreviations

CODE - Department of Code Administration
DCHS - Department of Community and Human Services
DEC - Department of Emergency & Customer Communications
DGS - Department of General Services
DPI - Department of Project Implementation
FINANCE - Department of Finance
FIRE - Alexandria Fire Department
HEALTH - Alexandria Health Department
INTERNAL AUDIT - Office of Internal Audit
ITS - Department of Information Technology Services
LIBRARY - Alexandria Library
OCPI - Office of Communications & Public Information
OHA - Office of Historic Alexandria
OOE - Office of Organizational Excellence
POLICE - Alexandria Police Department
RPCA - Department of Recreation, Parks, and Cultural Activities
T&ES - Department of Transportation and Environmental Services

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 18, 2020

Question: What is the cost of making the books in the Watson Reading Room available for borrowing in the Alexandria Library System?

Response:

In conversation with the Alexandria Black History Museum (ABHM) Director, Audrey Davis, and Office of Historic Alexandria Director, Gretchen Bulova, it was determined that ABHM would prefer to keep the material in the Watson Reading Room as non-circulating. Many of the items in the collection are out of print and irreplaceable. If a patron were to check them out and not return them, it would be a permanent loss to the collection.

If the ABHM wants to improve the visibility and awareness of the collection it is recommended that a vision and strategic plan for the Watson Reading Room first be established. However, if the current collection was to be integrated into the Alexandria Library public online catalog and listed as “reference” or “non-circulating” like the materials in the Law Library and Local History /Special Collections branch, the following costs would be associated:

Vendor extract, format, import any data “rescuable” from the current collection resource database. Estimated 4,000 items (3 months).	\$6,810-\$7,700
Creation and addition of an “Office of Historic Alexandria Branch” module into the Library’s current online system.	\$1,720
Cataloging Librarian \$35-\$50 per hour or Cataloging Paraprofessional (copy-cataloguer) (\$30-\$40 per hour)	Part Time Cataloger: \$26,400 (6 months) Part Time Paraprofessional: \$21,120 (6 months)
Library supplies (Labels, label covers, printer ink, book covers, etc.).	\$2,500
Total	\$32,150 - \$38,320

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 13, 2020

Question:

How much do we charge when an owner or developer wants to demolish their property? How much revenue came to us in each of the last years through these fees? What amounts do Arlington and Fairfax charge?

Response:

The following are the City's fees for demolition permits:

- Residential accessory building or detached garage - \$85.00
- Residential structure or non-residential accessory structure -\$150.00
- Non-residential structures - \$250.00
- Residential or Non-Residential Interior Demolition – Minimum Fee \$112.37
- A bond is also taken at \$1 per square foot of the building, which is returned once the building is demolished and the permit receives a final inspection
- \$125 per month for sidewalk closure
- \$30 per day per reserved parking spot

The City has collected \$34,085 in revenue over the past five years.

Fiscal Year	Demolition Fee
FY 2015	\$4,685
FY 2016	\$12,955
FY 2017	\$6,600
FY 2018	\$4,595
FY 2019	\$5,250
5-Year Total	\$34,085

FY 2020 year-to-date revenue is \$4,945.

Receipts are deposited to the permit fee special revenue fund for the purpose of covering the cost of plan review and inspections. This revenue has no impact on the General Fund.

Alexandria offers the lowest fee for interior demolition by charging the minimum fee of \$112.37.

In 2019, the Arlington County demolition fees increased from \$213.00 to \$218.00. The Alexandria non-residential/commercial demolition fee of \$250.00 is approximately 15% higher than Arlington County and 131% higher than the Fairfax County fee of \$108.

The Arlington County Manager’s FY 2021 proposed budget recommends adopting the proposed application of a 2.5% inflationary increase related to development services for inflation adjustments. The proposed FY 2021 demolition fee increases to \$223 from \$218 in 2019. There are no proposed changes to the fee schedules for Fairfax County and the City of Alexandria.

The following tables compare the City’s fee rates and structure to Arlington and Fairfax Counties:

Arlington County (2019 Fee Schedule)	
<u>Demolition</u>	<u>FEE</u>
Building or Structure	\$218.00
Interior demolition that does not involve any changes to structural or fire-rated assemblies	\$218.00
Arlington County (FY 2021 Proposed Fee Schedule)	
<u>Demolition</u>	<u>FEE</u>
Building or Structure	\$223.00
Interior demolition that does not involve any changes to structural or fire-rated assemblies	\$223.00

Fairfax County (2018 Fee Schedule)	
<u>Demolition</u>	<u>FEE</u>
Building or Structure	\$108.00
Partial Demolition for renovation: The fee for a permit to partially demolish a structure in preparation for renovation	2.40 % of Estimated Demo Cost

Alexandria City (2017 Fee Schedule)	
<u>Demolition</u>	<u>FEE</u>
Residential accessory building or detached garage	\$85.00
Residential structure or non-residential accessory structure	\$150.00
Non-residential structures	\$250.00
Residential or Non-Residential Interior Demolition	Minimum Fee \$112.37

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

Question:

Update of the summary pay comparator charts showing the results of the compensation recommendations included in the proposed budget.

Response:

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Police

Results of Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study

Police Captains and Police Lieutenants show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City’s target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). The City’s compensation policy states that “Pay programs are intended to be competitive at a minimum with the average pay of comparator organizations in the primary labor market.” Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all classifications for the pay program aligns with the market.

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
POLICE CAPTAIN	-9.86%
POLICE LIEUTENANT	-10.21%
POLICE SERGEANT	-1.78%
DETECTIVE III*	
DETECTIVE II*	
DETECTIVE I	-0.06%
POLICE OFFICER IV	-3.03%
POLICE OFFICER III	-2.47%
POLICE OFFICER II	-5.02%
POLICE OFFICER I	0.38%
Alexandria Deviation-Police Classifications	-4.01%

Benchmark Results After Proposed Increases to Police Pay Scale***

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale and targeted increases of two grades each for Police Captains and Police Lieutenants, all classifications on the police pay scale would be aligned with the midpoint of the market, and the average deviation from the midpoint exceeds the average by 0.02%.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers

March 23, 2020

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
POLICE CAPTAIN	1.82%
POLICE LIEUTENANT	1.25%
POLICE SERGEANT	-0.28%
DETECTIVE III*	
DETECTIVE II*	
DETECTIVE I	1.42%
POLICE OFFICER IV	-1.51%
POLICE OFFICER III	-0.96%
POLICE OFFICER II	-3.46%
POLICE OFFICER I	1.85%
Alexandria Deviation-Police Classifications	0.02%

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Sheriff

Results of Northern Virginia Comparator Benchmark Study

Chief Deputy Sheriff's, Deputy Sheriff Captains and Deputy Sheriff Lieutenants show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City's target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all of these classifications aligns with the market.

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
CHIEF DEPUTY SHERIFF**	-20.17%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - CAPTAIN	-4.28%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - LIEUTENANT	-6.28%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - SERGEANT	-1.61%
DEPUTY SHERIFF IV	-0.72%
DEPUTY SHERIFF III	-3.57%
DEPUTY SHERIFF II	0.04%
DEPUTY SHERIFF I	-0.56%
Alexandria Deviation-Sheriff Classifications	-4.64%

Benchmark Results After Proposed Increases to Sheriff Pay Scale***

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Chief Deputy Sheriff to the executive pay scale, and applying targeted increases of one grade for Deputy Sheriff Captains and Deputy Sheriff Lieutenants, all classifications on the sheriff pay scale would be aligned with the midpoint of the market and the average deviation from the midpoint exceeds the average by 0.46%.

Classification Title	Midpoint
DEPUTY SHERIFF - CAPTAIN	2.15%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - LIEUTENANT	0.00%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - SERGEANT	-0.11%
DEPUTY SHERIFF IV	0.77%
DEPUTY SHERIFF III	-2.04%
DEPUTY SHERIFF II	1.52%
DEPUTY SHERIFF I	0.92%
Alexandria Deviation-Sheriff Classifications	0.46%

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Fire

Results of Northern Virginia Comparator Benchmark Study

Deputy Fire Chief's and Firefighter I's show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City's target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all classifications aligns with the market.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF**	-12.18%
FIRE BATTALION CHIEF	-3.43%
FIRE CAPTAIN	-2.93%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	-1.64%
FIRE FIGHTER IV	4.50%
FIRE FIGHTER III****	-9.15%
FIRE FIGHTER II	-4.31%
FIRE FIGHTER I	-9.52%
Alexandria Deviation-Fire Classifications	-4.83%

Benchmark Results After Proposed Increases to Fire Pay Scale***

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Deputy Fire Chief to the executive pay scale, and applying a targeted increase of one grade for Firefighter I's, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -1.52%.

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
FIRE BATTALION CHIEF	-1.90%
FIRE CAPTAIN	-1.41%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	-0.14%
FIRE FIGHTER IV	5.91%
FIRE FIGHTER III****	-7.54%
FIRE FIGHTER II	-2.77%
FIRE FIGHTER I	-2.77%
Alexandria Deviation-Fire Classifications	-1.52%

**Public Safety Pay Competitiveness:
 Fire Marshal/Medics**

Results of Northern Virginia and Traditional Comparator

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

Benchmark Study

Classifications on the Fire Marshal/Medic pay scales meet or exceed the average midpoint in the market.

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHAL	8.41%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL III	-2.94%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL II	5.03%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL I	4.00%
EMS OPERATONS MANAGER	7.44%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	
EMS CAPTAIN/SUPERVISOR	7.97%
MEDIC IV	6.85%
MEDIC III	9.55%
MEDIC II	12.82%
Alexandria Deviation-Fire Marshal & Medic Classifications	6.57%

**Benchmark Results After Proposed Increases to
 Fire Marshal/Medic Pay Scale*****

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, classifications on this pay scale continue to meet or exceed the average of the market, with the average deviation from the midpoint exceeding the average by 7.95%. As noted below there are substantial positive deviations for single-role medics. This statistic is not meaningful as there are few single role medic positions in the DC region as nearly all of the region is on a dual role status.

Classification Title	Average Midpoint
ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHAL	9.76%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL III	-1.42%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL II	6.43%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL I	5.42%
EMS OPERATONS MANAGER	8.81%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	
EMS CAPTAIN/SUPERVISOR	9.33%
MEDIC IV	8.23%
MEDIC III	10.89%
MEDIC II	14.11%
Alexandria Deviation-Fire Marshal & Medic Classifications	7.95%

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

General Schedule Pay Competitiveness

The average deviation of benchmarked classifications on the general pay scale are currently aligned with the average of the midpoint of the market at -4.06% (within +/-5% of the average). After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, the average deviation from the midpoint is aligned with the average at -2.52%.

Results of Northern Virginia Comparator Benchmark Study	-4.06%
Benchmark Results After Proposed 1.5% Increases***	-2.52%

* No equivalent matches identified in the comparator market.

**Classification is proposed to move to the Executive pay scale.

***Reflects proposed 1.5% increase to all pay scales in FY21.

****Does not reflect additional 3% in specialty pay that is provided in addition to the base pay rate.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

June 26, 2020

Question:

What is the estimated cost of the Dog Park Master Plan Update listed in the Long-Range Planning Interdepartmental Work Program, and is there funding included in the FY 2021 Proposed Budget? Provide budget memo regarding what would be necessary in order to accelerate the Dog Park Plan.

Response:

The estimated cost to hire one temporary staff person to provide assistance with the Dog Park Master Plan Update is \$25,000. A combination of funding from the Open Space Acquisition and Development CIP project and the Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities (RPCA) FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget was originally intended to be used for the project, but it will now need to be delayed to a future fiscal year due to the removal of prior allocations from the Open Space Acquisition and Development project to offset revenue losses associated with the Covid-19 crisis.

The project could potentially be accelerated by four to six months with the hiring of a second temporary staff person at \$25,000, decreasing the total project duration from fifteen months to a range of nine to eleven months. Funding for the acceleration is not included in the FY 2021 Open Space Acquisition and Development CIP project or the RPCA FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget.

Anticipated to begin in January 2020, the plan start date had been delayed until July 2020. The delay in the start of the project was due to staff time dedicated to the completion of the 2020 Pocket Park Plan (completed February 2020); Athletic Field Plan Update (scheduled completion April 2020); and the initiation of the Open Space Policy Plan (implemented January 2020). In addition, staff time dedicated to unanticipated projects like the acceleration of ACPS Modernization Projects including the High School Project; MacArthur/Patrick Henry Swing Space; and MacArthur Modernization project contributed to the delay in the start date and may result in a longer planning process. The project will now need to be delayed to a future fiscal year.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

April 28, 2020

Question:

Please provide a list of school properties and which entity owns the property.

Response:

According to the City’s Office of Real Estate Assessments, below is the list of stated ownership of each ACPS school site:

School Site	Owner
Charles Barrett Elementary	School Board
Cora Kelly Elementary	City
Douglas Macarthur Elementary	City
Ferdinand T. Day Elementary	School Board
Francis Hammond Middle	City
George Mason Elementary	City
George Washington Middle	City
James K Polk Elementary	City
Jefferson Houston (K-8)	City
John Adams Elementary	City
Lyles Crouch Elementary	City
Matthew Maury Elementary	City
Mt. Vernon Elementary	City
Patrick Henry (K-8)	City
Samuel Tucker Elementary	School Board
T.C. Williams High – King Street Campus	City
T.C. Williams High – Minnie Howard Campus	City
William Ramsay Elementary	City

Ownership of school properties per the Office of Real Estate Assessment may differ from how the ownership of properties are characterized in City financial statements, like the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The Virginia Code requires that school assets to be recorded in the City’s financial statements while the bonds used to pay for these assets are still outstanding. The assets will transfer to the Alexandria School Board’s financial statements when the bonds are repaid. While the assets may be listed under either the ownership of the City or the School Board, nothing in the state code alters the authority or responsibility of the local school board or control of the assets.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

July 29, 2020

Question: How are current projects performing within the costing guidelines? Are projects being completed under or over budget?

Response:

Due to staffing reprioritizations resulting from the COVID-19 public health emergency, a response to this budget question has been deferred until fall 2020. Staff intend to provide a response to this question as part of a broader discussion of capital projects and processes during the fall 2020 CIP budget work sessions.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 15, 2020

Question: Provide a history of improvements made to Holmes Run Trail.

Response:

The Holmes Run Trail is an uninterrupted off-street trail that connects Chambliss St. in the west end of the City to Eisenhower Ave. in the southeast portion of the City. The Holmes Run Trail also connects to the Dora Kelley Trail that links the Sanger Ave. street end; Beauregard St. and N. Morgan St. to Dora Kelley Park. Annual maintenance includes trimming of vegetation, invasive and dead tree removal, tree planting, and ecological restoration plantings. Staff repairs benches and park features and removes debris from the hard surface trail. Additional maintenance activities include hard surface trail inspections and minor repairs of the asphalt and concrete portions of the trail. Maintenance of hard surface trails and soft surface trails are divided between Transportation and Environmental Services and Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities. Maintenance of vegetation is the responsibility of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities and is implemented by staff and with volunteer groups. Larger maintenance and improvement projects to the trail system in the past ten years include:

- CY 2012
 - Installation of Trail Mile Markers (Phase I)
- CY 2013
 - Installation of a new crossing at the Fairfax County border
 - Installation of Fitness Stations
- CY 2015
 - Installation of Trail Mile Markers (Phase II)
 - Repairs to the trail boardwalks in Dora Kelley Nature Park
 - EcoCounter (bike/ped counter) installed
- CY 2016
 - Asphalt resurfacing to several trail segments from Chambliss St. to Eisenhower Ave.
- CY 2017
 - Repairs to the Dora Kelley Flexi Pave Trail connecting Sanger Ave. to the Holmes Run Trail
 - High water detour signage installed between North Beauregard Street and North Ripley Street
 - Installation of Trail Mile Markers (Phase III)
- CY 2018
 - New trail constructed east of I-395 and streambank stabilization work
 - New pedestrian and bicycle bridge at Ripley St.

- CY 2019
 - Crosswalks installed on Holmes Run Pkwy to improve access to Holmes Run Trail
 - Sidewalk widened on N Beauregard St to improve access to Holmes Run Trail
 - New trail kiosks in Dora Kelley Park
 - Removal of damaged/fallen trees between Beauregard and I-395

Given the storm damage caused by storms in 2018 and 2019, the FY 2021 CIP has \$1.0 million in trail rebuild and repair design and engineering funds, and the FY 2022 CIP has \$15.0 million in (re)construction funds programmed.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 15, 2020

Question:

Provide a status update on the facility condition for Fire Station 206. What improvements are planned over the next 10 years to maintain state of good repair for this facility?

Response:

Fire Station 206 is located at 4609 Seminary Road, and has a current Facility Condition Index of 0.32 (Grade C). The Fire Station Optimal Location Study completed in 2017 recommended that Station 206 eventually be moved west of I-395. The response time benefits of moving Station 206 are not material at this time but will be more important if the Beauregard corridor redevelops. Fire Station 206 was originally added to the CIP in FY 2010 and scheduled for FY 2021 – FY 2023. In 2018, the Ad Hoc Joint City-Schools Facilities Investment Task Force recommended moving the Fire Station outside of the 10-year planning window of the CIP. The Task Force commented that the unfunded project should continue to be considered in the broader CIP cycle.

The capital replacement priorities as reflected in the proposed CIP and Station 203 currently being rebuilt. Station 208 which may get replaced as part of the Landmark Mall redevelopment and Station 207 on Duke Street.

While the Station 206 is ranked as a grade C, it is programmatically deficient for the current needs of the Fire Department, including the following issues:

- Bay door heights limit the height of the apparatus
- 4 staffed units in 2 bays limits the overall length of vehicles stationed there
- 4 staffed units require 2 of these units to respond from the back of the fire station
- Building was not designed for modern 11 on-duty, 24-hour staffing
- There is no room to expand services for the growing community, especially for medical transport capabilities

To maintain Fire Station 206 and to address some of the programmatic needs of the Fire Department, the following improvements are contemplated as part of the Proposed FY 2021 – FY 2030 CIP:

- Bay door replacement with modern 4-fold door that provide a safer and quicker operations
- Retrofit of building with a new cooling and heating system
- Replace windows with energy efficient windows
- Additional interior improvements

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 15, 2020

Question: The proposed budget indicates that we will switch back to cash financing of fire apparatus yet proposes a decade of bond-financed investment in fire apparatus. What is the rationale and timing for this planned transition?

Response:

In FY 2012, the City approved a plan to begin replacing the Fire Department's fleet through the use of debt financing. The plan was designed as a 10-year plan and accelerated vehicle purchases through debt financing and then repaying the costs from the vehicle and equipment replacement fund. As a result of this plan, the City was able to catch up on its equipment replacement needs.

The City is now nearing the end of this 10-year plan to accelerate replacements, and is reviewing options to convert back to a cash financing plan for fire equipment replacements; long-term use of debt financing vehicle replacement is not considered a best practice. Staff are currently developing options for this conversion, along with associated costs, and plan to present options to the City Manager later this spring. The City Manager's recommendation for this conversion to a cash financing plan may likely be presented to City Council this fall, and included in the City Manager's Proposed FY 2022 Budget.

This strategy would require no additional funding in FY 2021 but could require an increase in General Fund cash capital in for FY 2022. Based on emerging COVID-19 related economic conditions, staff will likely re-evaluate this option as part of the FY 2022 budget and CIP development. The Proposed FY 2021 – FY 2030 CIP maintains a bond financing plan for Fire Vehicle and Heavy Apparatus replacement, to ensure adequate borrowing capacity is held in reserve for these vehicle purchases, until the bond-to-cash financing plan is finalized.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 28, 2020

Question:

In addition to a reduction of the funds available for open space acquisition, the proposed CIP shifts to exclusively bond finance for open space. How are these funds proposed to be utilized in the future?

Response:

The Open Space project is intended to fund land acquisition opportunities that will support recommendations identified in the City Council approved 2003/2017 (update) Open Space Plan; the 2019 Environmental Action Plan; and recommendations resulting from the City Council reinstated Open Space Steering Committee to assist staff with the development of an Open Space Policy Plan (2019 EAP recommendation). In future years, bond funding is the identified funding source to ensure adequate borrowing capacity is reserved in the event of a significant land acquisition opportunity. However, at the time of an acquisition opportunity, City staff will make an appropriate financing recommendation for the purchase, which may include a mix of funding sources.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 15, 2020

Question: Improvements for Ewald Park are proposed in two separate capital projects. Can you provide an overview of the scope and timing of the overall Ewald improvements?

Response:

The Department of Recreation, Parks and Cultural Activities groups improvements together for individual parks where possible to achieve design and construction efficiencies and minimize community impacts. In conformance with this strategy, the improvements on Page 11.18 (Parks CFMP) (\$340,000) and Page 11.23 (Playgrounds CFMP) (\$657,285) of the FY 2021 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) are components of the phased implementation of the Ewald Park Neighborhood Parks Plan. The Neighborhood Park Plan for Ewald Park was endorsed in 2015 by the Park and Recreation Commission and modified in 2018 to incorporate a Parkour component. The recommendations are planned in the ten-year CIP in phases. Implementation of the 10 recommendations of the plan total \$3 million to \$3.8 million in 2015 dollars. An initial phase to remove the existing pool and pool house was funded in FY 2018 and has been completed. In FY 2020, a Community Matching Fund project was approved for \$80,000 to design and install Parkour Equipment. This project is currently in the fundraising phase. The initiatives scheduled for FY 2022 and FY 2023 total \$997,285 and will address the redesign of the park including all recommendations in the 2015 plan, early implementation of supporting park infrastructure such as utilities, and the implementation of the playground renovation, which is identified as one of the highest priority items.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 21, 2020

Question:

What are the ROM costs of the major components of the City Hall Renovation project? What alternatives to the full project scope have been considered?

Response:

The major component replacements for the City Hall Renovation project represents approximately \$35 million (present value in today's dollars) of the proposed project costs. This amount consists of the following major components and systems:

Component/System Group	Estimated Present Value Cost (in millions)	Percentage of Total Cost
Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing	\$12.47	35.63%
Exterior Preservation	\$10.35	29.57%
Fire Protection/Life Safety	\$2.07	5.91%
Structure/Interior Construction	\$10.11	28.89%
Total	\$35.00	100%

The \$35 million represents the raw replacement costs, however factoring in design and project planning, along with cost escalation to the anticipated construction timeline, this cost is estimated by General Services to increase to \$56.4 million for major component replacement. This amount of funding would replace the major components and systems of City Hall, however this amount would not contemplate any programmatic changes or space allocation for City Hall to align with the changing needs of staff, City Council, or the public in general. For example, implementation of new office space standards or expansion of community meeting spaces would not be included in the \$56.4 million cost.

The Proposed CIP recommends a budget of \$79 million for the renovation of City Hall, structural repairs of the Market Square parking garage, and outfitting a swing space for staff during these renovations. This proposed project budget represents 75 percent of the project cost estimate, which is based on recently experienced costs (per square foot) of renovating and modernizing (and replacing of major systems) historic buildings in the DC metro region. The square footage cost was the basis of the budget estimate along with industry standard percentages for Architect and Engineering services and other project related costs. The renovation would include design, new furniture and fixtures installed in accordance with City space standards, building improvements, and building system replacements.

Staff have considered several alternatives, including a scenario in which only major systems are replaced (\$56.4 M), along with staged renovations that would include partial closures of City Hall. The staged

closure scenarios dramatically increase the overall project costs but do allow for spreading the costs of the renovation project over several fiscal years. This approach has the disadvantage of 'piecemeal' replacements of major systems, and a longer period of disruption of regular operations at City Hall. Staff did not recommend a staged renovation due to the lack of overall cost savings, and the potential negative impacts of a prolonged disturbance period and the inefficiencies likely to result from piecemeal systems replacement.

Staff will continue to explore alternatives and to develop a more specific plan and costing in the FY 2022 CIP (design) and FY 2023/FY 2024 CIP (construction).

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 15, 2020

Question:

Can you provide the timing and proposed process for determining a future site of Fire Station 207?

Response:

The Department of General Services (DGS), in cooperation with the Alexandria Fire Department (AFD) and Alexandria Economic Development Partnership (AEDP), continues to investigate potential sites for relocation and rebuild of Fire Station 207. The timeline for this project is dependent in part on a viable site coming available for purchase. When this opportunity presents itself, staff will present funding options to City Council to acquire land for the station. Staff anticipates that a viable land acquisition opportunity may become available by FY 2024, when construction of the new station is contemplated in the Proposed FY 2021 – FY 2030 CIP.

Approval

Deputy City Manager: _____

Revise and Publish

City Manager: _____

Revise for Second Review

Date: _____

Re-Write and Submit Again

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

Question: The proposed CIP proposes the use of TIP funds to finance Street Reconstruction & Resurfacing beginning in FY 2023. How does this proposed use align with the purpose of the TIP funding?

Response:

In FY 2012, City Council approved funding equal to 2.2 cents on the base real estate tax rate and additional General Fund cash capital to create a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the purpose of expanding transportation infrastructure and transit options throughout the City including new construction/implementation and the ongoing operating costs of those new or expanded services. As part of the FY 2015 budget process, new NVTAs funding became available to the City for expanded transportation and transit infrastructure. Accordingly, City Council approved broadening eligible expenditures to be funded by the TIP. While the TIP was originally for expanded transportation and transit infrastructure, the broader definition allowed for TIP funding to be used for any transportation related capital expenditure or operating expenditure. Expanding this definition has allowed the City to direct TIP resources toward the maintenance of its existing transportation infrastructure while using the new NVTAs funding, private development contributions, and the continued use of TIP proceeds to advance expanded transportation and transit infrastructure and services throughout the City. The TIP currently funds capital improvements, operating costs, and debt service on portions of General Obligation Bonds issued in FY 2013.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 17, 2020

Question:

How do the proposed capital investments align with the requirements of the City's MS4 permit? What reduction targets (nutrient, sediment, etc) will successful completion of these projects allow the City to achieve? What overall system capacity improvements are proposed? What additional investments or acceleration would be feasible if further stormwater utility funding were made available during the 10-year CIP?

Response:

Alignment of Proposed Capital Investments with City's MS4 Permit

Proposed capital investments align with planning of the three phases of 5-year MS4 permit requirements to achieve Chesapeake Bay pollution reduction targets. Approximately 50% of the entire proposed Stormwater CIP is programmed for water quality improvement purposes and meeting these targets. Each phase is associated with a 5-year MS4 permit reduction targets of 5%, 40%, and 100%, respectively. The City is currently in the second permit cycle (2018 – 2023) requiring the City to meet 40% of the total target. With the recent completion of the Lake Cook Retrofit, the City has now achieved 55% of its target and is thus ahead of the regulatory goal.

Regional pond retrofit projects are effective pollution reduction projects with high return on investment, because the facilities treat hundreds of acres of runoff. The City's strategy to meet its MS4 permit goals now also includes urban stream restorations that are also cost-effective ways to remove pollutants. The City has several stream restoration projects planned (discussed below) that should drive down the overall cost of Bay pollution reduction compliance.

Targets Reached by Completing Planned Projects

With the completion of Ben Brenman Pond Retrofit scheduled for spring 2020, the City will be at approximately 70% reduction needed for the current total phosphorus reduction target. Through the implementation of the planned urban stream restorations, including Lucky Run, Strawberry Run and Taylor Run, the City will be on track to achieve approximately 90-95% of the total target. The most recent Watershed Implementation Plan Phase III (WIP III) that outlines Virginia's Chesapeake Bay cleanup targets discusses local area pollution reduction goals for localities that are not currently required in localities' MS4 permits. The WIP III and discussions with regulatory agencies indicate the potential for these new local area pollution reduction goals to be added to the City's current MS4 permit pollution reductions. If this were to occur, the City would need to achieve pollution reductions beyond the known mandated levels.

System Capacity Improvements and Potential Accelerations

These are large, complex, multi-year, multimillion-dollar CIP projects. Funding for design and construction is currently proposed in the Storm Sewer Capacity CIP project. Due to the complexity of analysis, design, and construction, staff believe that a slight acceleration in funding may accelerate implementation. Moving funding forward in the CIP will provide for accelerated service delivery; however, staff do not believe additional funding beyond current proposed levels will accelerate service delivery.

Based on previous work, we have prioritized problem areas. More data and work on feasibility is required in the near term and is included in the CIP. Following that work, staff anticipate one or two large projects that will take about a year to design and take 1 – 2 years to construct that will cause a lot of disruption in the right-of-way. Currently staff have proposed funding in FY 2025 and again in FY 2028 for these large projects. It is possible that the FY 2025 funding could be moved up to FY 2023 to allow for starting the construction invitation to bid (ITB) process, with work taking place second half of FY 2023 or in FY 2024. Subsequently, funding currently proposed in FY 2028 could be moved up to FY 2026. This would be contingent on keeping the proposed civil engineer III FTE for stormwater management that is currently in the Manager's proposed budget. While the overall 10-Year CIP would not be impacted, the stormwater utility rate would need to be adjusted in the 10-Year Plan coincident with the changes in funding for those fiscal years.

Although changes to the scheduling of projects could allow for some acceleration, this is not the recommendation of staff at this time. In response to the COVID-19 public health emergency, the City Manager recommended deferring the FY 2021 Stormwater Utility rate increase. An increase in the Stormwater Utility rate may be examined as part of the FY 2022 budget development process; and evaluated relative to the City's economic recovery from COVID-19. Reexamining the rate may also impact the use and timing of borrowing to support major Stormwater Management projects.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 1, 2020

Question:

Can you provide a refresh of FY 2020 Budget Question 18? Can you please provide a detailing of the number of children served across the Early Childhood Program Area, the cost breakdown of each service area, and estimates of the current waiting lists for service in each area (quantity and duration)? Please include the financial impact of plausible service expansions in this area, including the availability of State or Federal dollars.

Response:

The Childhood Program is allocated \$8.4 million in the City's FY 2021 Approved Budget. \$5.2 million was budgeted for non-personnel across the Early Childhood programs; \$4.9 million is allocated for the purchase of child care services. Of this, \$2.7 million is budgeted for personnel costs for the 23.00 FTEs who work on early childhood issues.

The 23.00 FTEs in the Early Childhood Program provide a continuum of services for individuals and families, that include: providing case management for individuals with developmental disorders, enrolling and providing case management services for children in child care services, regulating family child care homes, facilitating the professional development of early childhood providers, delivering early developmental intervention services and implementing early childhood mental health prevention, early intervention and treatment services.

Additionally, the Early Childhood Program receives a State Budget Allocation of \$8.3 million for child care assistance (TANF, Transitional Child Care and the Fee System). This funding is expended at the State level for childcare vendors in the City while services are managed locally, and therefore \$8.3 million is not reflected in the City budget. The total funding available for child care assistance/purchased services is \$13.3 million for FY 2021.

Purchased Child Care Services/Child Care Assistance

Services in FY2021 City Proposed Budget Service Area	General Fund	Grants/Other Revenue	Total FY2021 Proposed Budget	VDSS Allocation Outside Financial Custody of Alexandria	Total Proposed Program Funding
TANF and Transitional Child Care	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,907,137	\$2,907,137
State Child Care Subsidy Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,066,450	\$5,066,450
Head Start Wrap Around	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$373,034	\$373,034
Head Start	\$196,541	\$2,386,786	\$2,583,327	\$0	\$2,583,327
Scholarships for 4s	\$253,005	\$0	\$253,005	\$0	\$253,005
Local Child Care Subsidy Program	\$331,000	0	\$331,000	0	\$331,000
School Age Child Care*	\$1,741,835	\$0	\$1,741,835	\$0	\$1,741,835
Totals	<u>\$2,522,381</u>	<u>\$2,386,786</u>	<u>\$4,909,167</u>	<u>\$8,346,621</u>	<u>\$13,255,788</u>

**School Age Child Care: Represents the Department's agreement with The Campagna Center and includes \$22,731 for program monitoring and scholarships.*

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Transitional Child Care

FY 2021 Budget: \$2,907,137

Average number of Children served per month FY 2019: 303

Number of Children on Waiting List: 0

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Transitional Child Care consists of Federal and State funds. These are mandated programs so funds are made available by the State as they are needed and therefore, these programs have no wait lists.

State Child Care Subsidy Program

FY 2021 State Budget: \$5,066,450

Average number of Children served per month FY 2019: 442

Number of Children on Waiting List: 41*

**Currently there are 41 children on the waitlist. We have authorization to serve 23 children from the waitlist and 22 of them are in varying stages of either providing needed documentation or selecting a childcare provider. One slot is being held to serve an emergency childcare need for a newborn whose family is involved with the child welfare system.*

The State notified localities in January 2020, that they could not fund additional children for childcare subsidies. Localities were required to re-instate their waitlists. Since FY 2017, DCHS maintained a rolling waitlist with families positioned on the waitlist for no more than 30 days when funds were available, and the family completed their required documentation and selection of a provider. Efficient waitlist

management processes enabled the department to draw down its maximum state subsidy funds in FY19 and FY20; thereby freeing up local subsidy funds to provide funding in the scholarship program for four-year olds. The current market rate survey is in progress and will be a likely driver for future state funding. The 2018 market rate survey resulted in a 42% increase for both center based and family child care.

Head Start Wrap-Around

FY 2021 State Budget: \$373,034

Average number of Children served per month FY 2019: 48

Head Start Wrap-Around funds are 100% Federal and are made available as needed by the State to provide before- and after-school services to Head Start children who need care beyond the 6-hour Head Start program day. The increased funding amount reflects the mandatory increased hourly rate.

Alexandria Head Start

FY 2021 budget: \$2,583,327

Average number of Children served per month FY 2019: 309

Number of Children on Waiting List: 95

The Alexandria Head Start (AHS) program is funded for 309 children and maintains a waiting list of three- and four-year-olds. The number of children the program can serve is determined by the funding level provided by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Head Start Office. The Campagna Center has one VPI classroom and VPI children are included with Head Start children in a blended classroom.

The waiting list is determined by a point system based on factors such as percent of poverty level and violence in the home, not by the date of application. Four-year olds receive priority. Families with fewer factors as compared to others may remain on the waiting list for a longer period of time, while those with greater needs are prioritized to be placed in a classroom as space becomes available. Families are also referred to other programs for which they might be eligible. The registration process begins in March each year. The financial eligibility limit for AHS is 100 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

Scholarship Program for 4 Year Olds

FY 2021 Budget: \$480,000

Average number of Children served per month FY 2019: 62

Number of Children on Waiting List: 0

DCCHS, in consultation with participating VPI partners and the Bruhn Morris Foundation, identified a child care funding administration plan that closely aligned with the service priorities, establishes a sustainable process for how funding is awarded, and, invites capacity building and partnership innovation through a mixed delivery system that leads to expansion capacity and closing the gap of unmet needs. The name "Scholarship Program for 4 Year Olds" will sunset to reflect the expansion opportunities that now exist to serve pre-school age children and will now be known as "DCCHS Early Childhood Readiness Services".

Local Child Care Subsidy Fee System

FY2021 Budget: \$104,005

Average number of Children served per month FY19: 17

Number of Children on Waiting List: 0

This program area is supported 100% through the General Fund. The per child funding amount for local subsidy follows the state subsidy rates which are determined based on the age of the child, program type, any special needs of the child, and attendance frequency. The number of children served can be higher or lower based on these patterns of children enrolled.

In order to leverage our maximum drawdown of state subsidy dollars, children were moved from local subsidy funding whenever additional state subsidy funding became available. This allowed greater flexibility for meeting the needs of a wider pool of low-income families and to cover budget shortages in the scholarship program for four-year olds.

School Age Child Care

FY 2021 Budget: \$1,741,835

Number of Children served FY19: 805

Number of Children on Waiting List: 0

The Campagna Kids program has no children on the waiting list for any of its eleven sites. Parents are referred to other community programs in the City that offer afterschool care. When a wait list exists, the length of waiting time varies depending on the site, parents' needs, preferences and other resources available in the community.

Direct Services Provided by DCHS Clinical Staff

Direct Services Provided by DCHS Clinical Staff*	General Fund	Granting/Other Revenue Proposed	Total FY2021 Proposed Budget
Parent Infant Education (PIE)	\$528,142	\$880,751	\$1,408,893
Intellectual Disability Case Management Services	\$391,405	\$0	\$391,405
Preschool Mental Health Prevention	\$304,035	\$37,912	\$341,947
Totals	<u>\$1,223,582</u>	<u>\$918,663</u>	<u>\$2,142,245</u>

Direct services include the personnel total of \$1,267,888 and non-personnel total of \$874,357

Early Intervention/ Developmental Disability and Mental Health Service

FY2021 Budget: \$2,142,245

Individuals Served /Services Provided FY19: 1,138

Number of Children on Waiting List: None

The Parent-Infant Education (PIE) program provides early intervention, assessment, case management and treatment services for children 0-21 years of age. The services are provided through three specialized units: Part C Early Intervention; Developmental Disabilities Case Management; and Early Childhood Wellness.

The Part C Early Intervention Program provides assessment, case management and developmental therapy services for children birth to age 3 years utilizing evidence-based practices within the child's natural environment settings. Services were provided to 574 children in FY19. Per Federal law, there can be no waitlist for these services. In FY19, the average monthly caseload per case manager approached 85 children. This far exceeds the best practice maximum of 45-50 cases. Two long-term temporary positions in this unit will be converted to full-time permanent and this should assist in attracting and retaining high quality staff.

The Youth Developmental Disabilities Program provides intake, assessment, monitoring and support coordination services to individuals age 3- 21 years. The staff in this program served 134 individuals in FY19. Of these, 29 children and youth were enrolled in active case management and, 105 individuals received on-going support and monitoring in order to access Medicaid Waiver programs. This program is staffed by 2 FTE of which one position serves a split function as both the supervisor for the program and as a case manager. In order to meet the service demand and requirements, this program additionally employs one (1) long term temporary employee on a full-time basis. Proposed restructuring of this unit would include the conversion of the temporary position into a fully funded FTE.

The Preschool Prevention Team provides evidence-based prevention, early intervention and treatment services for preschool children ages 4-6 that are designed to increase social skills and reduce aggressive behavior. The program also provides support and consultation to parents, teachers and administrators. In FY19, the team operated with significant critical staffing vacancies for much of the year to provide 769 hours of mental health consultation in preschool classrooms and 300 hours of early intervention services to young children (0-5 years old) and their families, serving 430 children.

Virginia Preschool Initiative (VPI) Budget Managed by Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS)

Average number of Children served per month FY19: 385

The Virginia Preschool Initiative in Alexandria is appropriated and managed by the Alexandria City Public Schools (ACPS) and funded in the ACPS budget. 385 children are being served in quality VPI early childhood classrooms: 192 in school-based programs and 193 in community-based child care centers.

Service Expansion Plausibility

The programs will seek to access any new state and federal funding in order to implement its revised approach for moving the system to a more financially sustainable framework for providers, stabilization of existing service provision and closing of significant funding gaps between actual costs of services and existing state and local funding support. Additional funds coming from the state have largely supported much needed professional development and quality improvements. Without additional local funds, opportunities to pilot any expansion of VPI children served will not be feasible.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 29, 2020

Question:

What would be the fiscal impact of extending the outdoor pool season past Labor Day into September?

Response:

Recreation, Parks & Cultural Activities (RPCA) has funding the FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget to extend Old Town Pool season through the month of September in 2020 due to the Chinguapin capital facilities maintenance program (CFMP) projects that will close the indoor pool, including replastering, replacement of the skylights, retiling around the pool deck, and the installation of a new elevator. Given expected lower attendance once school starts, staffing will be approximately \$1,400 per week. RPCA will be utilizing Chinguapin year-round staff.

The staffing costs for Memorial and Warwick Pools are slightly less (\$900 to \$1,100/week). This is based on later afternoon/early evening weekday hours and 6 hours on Saturday and Sunday.

Please note that RPCA has a difficult time staffing the outdoor pools beginning in late August when many of the college student employees return to school. Keeping one pool open may be feasible, but it is likely they would not have staff adequate to cover all three pools in September.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 18, 2020

Question:

What would be the fiscal impact of a full elimination of fare collection for DASH bus service? What would be the fiscal impact of elimination of fares on individual routes? What would be the estimated ridership impact of such a change? What intergovernmental revenues may be available from the proposed "Transit Incentive Program" currently proposed for funding in the Commonwealth's budget? (Mayor Wilson)

Response:

1. What would be the fiscal impact of a full elimination of fare collection for DASH bus service?
2. What would be the fiscal impact of elimination of fares on individual routes?
3. What would be the estimated ridership impact of such a change?
4. What intergovernmental revenues may be available from the proposed "Transit Incentive Program" currently proposed for funding in the Commonwealth's budget?
5. Are there any other fare reduction options that may be viable?

- 1. What would be the fiscal impact of a full elimination of fare collection for DASH bus service?**
- 3. What would be the estimated ridership impact of such a change?**

Full Fare Elimination Scenario

Most simply, the impact would be a loss of the \$4,024,000 in passenger revenue budgeted in FY 2021, offset by \$256,000 in operating cost savings, for a net fiscal impact of \$3,768,000.

The ridership impact of such a change is difficult to determine accurately as there have been few precedents. DC Circulator's experiment running fare-free in 2019 needs to be studied in greater detail (data is not presently available to staff). **A conservative estimate of 10% ridership growth would result in a ridership increase of approximately 277,000 from projected FY 2021 revenue boardings of 2.77 million.**

Potential Operating and Capital Cost Savings

There are at least two factors that could mitigate this revenue loss and corresponding subsidy increase. The first is indirect and uncertain, which is that the assumed increase in ridership from fare-free service would lead to an increase in operating grant support from the Commonwealth. The ridership impact, however, is very difficult to model or predict, as is how this would precisely impact state operating support. This operating grant is also paid directly to the City's trust account with the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) and is used to offset the City's operating and capital contributions to WMATA. The actual impact to the City's ability to fund DASH is therefore indirect.

The second mitigating factor, the savings of operating and capital costs of fare collection, is both direct and quantifiable. Staff estimate annual operating cost savings of roughly \$256,000 (included above).

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

Annual Operating Cost of Fare Collection	
Annual ATC Contribution to Regional SmarTrip Budget	60,000
Farebox Cash Collection Contract	50,000
10 Maintenance Hours per Day at \$31 average hourly rate (estimated - farebox probing, cash vaulting)	112,530
Regular Farebox Repair Costs	30,000
<i>DASH Bus</i> Mobile App Fees (5% of revenue processed - will scale with customer use)	3,600
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING COST OF FARE COLLECTION	256,130

For reference, recent capital investments in fare collection include the following (to be clear, these are not anticipated future savings):

Recent Fare Collection Capital Investments	
16 New Fareboxes (8 reimbursed by I-395 Commuter Choice)	184,967
<i>DASH Bus</i> Mobile App - Development Fee (reimbursed by DRPT)	75,000
Total Recent Capital Investments	259,967

Future capital investments in fare collection could potentially include electronic validation equipment for a future DASH, WMATA, or regional mobile app and/or new fareboxes. WMATA is currently in the development process for its next generation farebox. Most likely, DASH would not be required to upgrade its entire fleet at once when that farebox is introduced. Rather, new fareboxes would be introduced with each new replacement or expansion bus.

Potential Future Fare Collection Capital Investments	
New Farebox Cost per Bus (100 buses in DASH fleet)	20,000
Electronic Validation for Mobile App (whether DASH, WMATA, or regional app)	500,000

Impact of DASH Fare-Free vs. Metrobus Maintaining Fares

Finally, it should be noted that operating DASH as a fare-free system introduces a disconnect between DASH service and other regional transit service, most notably Metrobus. The DASH and Metrobus networks are designed to be complementary rather than competitive. This will be even more the case in the new Alexandria Transit Vision Plan network which assigns different corridors to the two providers. For one route to be free while the other is not, when these routes serve different communities, neighborhoods, and activity centers, could introduce equity concerns. Depending on the outcome of WMATA's FY 2021 budget process, Metrobus riders connecting to Metrorail would essentially have a free trip with the increase in transfer discount rising to the full \$2 bus fare, however this would not be the case for riders only utilizing Metrobus.

- 2. What would be the fiscal impact of elimination of fares on individual routes?**
- 3. What would be the estimated ridership impact of such a change?**

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 18, 2020

As noted above regarding DASH vs. Metrobus routes, staff likewise do not recommend the elimination of fares on some DASH routes and not others, primarily due to equity concerns. At the same time, this has the potential to increase the complexity of the system for customers. It is easy to imagine customers being confused about which buses charge fares and which do not, especially when multiple routes serve the same stops and when customers are transferring between routes. Forecasting the fiscal impact on an individual route basis is also challenging to do accurately since the impact on each route will depend on whether other adjacent routes are free.

Off-Peak Fare-Free Scenario

If an option with a more limited fiscal impact than full fare elimination is desired, staff propose the elimination of fares during off-peak periods. The peak period is 6:00-9:00am and 3:00-6:00pm on weekdays. This proposal would therefore eliminate fares at all other times.

In an off-peak fare-free scenario, **staff estimate a \$2.0 million decline in passenger revenue, from \$4.0 million budgeted for FY 2021 in a no-change scenario.** This is based on an increase in revenue boardings of about 138,000 trips (5%). Including current fare-free ridership (students, King Street Trolley), this would represent a 3.6% total ridership increase over the baseline FY21 scenario.

	FY 2020	FY 2021 No Change		FY 2021 Off-Peak Fare-Free			
	Revenue Boardings	Revenue Boardings	Passenger Revenue	Revenue Boardings	Passenger Revenue	Net Revenues	Net Boardings
Peak	1,187,515	1,245,263	\$1,918,483	1,111,397	\$2,014,408	\$95,925	(133,866)
Off-Peak	1,451,407	1,521,988	\$2,105,517	1,794,217	-0-	(\$2,105,517)	272,229
Total	2,638,922	2,767,251	\$4,024,000	2,905,614	\$2,014,408	(\$2,009,592)	138,363

In calculating the fiscal impact, staff made the following assumptions:

1. FY21 baseline revenue boardings will increase 4.6% from FY 2020 to roughly 2.77 million. The increase is due to ridership losses in FY 2020 during WMATA's Platform Improvement Project and the full-year effect of service enhancements on the AT-1 Plus and AT-9.
2. With free off-peak fares, 15% of current peak riders will move their trips to the off-peak periods. Many riders must travel during the peak to commute to work, however customers running errands may be able to change their schedules to take advantage of free fares.
3. Free off-peak fares will lead to a 5% overall ridership increase. Ridership gains will not be limited to the off-peak period. Many customers will be able to take advantage of off-peak free trips even if the other half of their commute is during the peak period. Ridership gains, peak and off-peak, may be much more significant. However, staff believe this is a conservative estimate. Staff will continue to research potential benchmarks such as the DC Circulator's period of free service in 2019.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 18, 2020

There would be no significant fare collection cost savings in eliminating fares during off-peak periods. Every bus would still need to have its farebox serviced every night and cash would still need to be securely collected, counted, and deposited. It is possible that DASH's contribution to the SmarTrip budget may be slightly lower due to reduced usage-based fees in this scenario.

4. What intergovernmental revenues may be available from the proposed "Transit Incentive Program" currently proposed for funding in the Commonwealth's budget?

The recently passed transportation bill by the Virginia General Assembly (HB 1414) directs the Commonwealth Transportation Board to "establish a Transit Incentive Program to promote improved transit service in urbanized areas of the Commonwealth with a population in excess of 100,000 and to reduce barriers to transit use for low-income individuals" ([§ 33.2-1526.1:2](#)).

[Materials available from the General Assembly](#) estimate that roughly \$1.9 million will be available statewide in FY21, rising to \$4.7 million by FY24. The bill provides that a maximum of 25% of this funding shall be used "to support the establishment of programs to reduce the impact of fares on low-income individuals, including reduced-fare programs and elimination of fares." Presumably the remaining funding in this Program will be used to further its other goals, including the "establishment of routes of regional significance, the development and implementation of a regional subsidy allocation model, implementation of integrated fare collection, [and] establishment of bus-only lanes on routes of regional significance."

Over the coming months, staff expect the Board will establish funding guidelines and opportunities for grant applications. **Given the funding expectations set by the legislation, it is reasonable to assume funding will be available to help support the design and development of reduced-fare or no-fare programs. Full funding of such programs appears to be beyond the scope of this legislation.**

5. Are there any other fare reduction options that may be viable?

Yes, a discount or free DASH pass to low-income household would target a fare revenue reduction to the persons who need it most.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

June 26, 2020

Question:

What is the estimated fiscal and operational impact of ending the outsourced relationship for recycling collection and insourcing this service?

Response:

The estimated impact of bringing the recycling collection in-house in year one would be approximately \$2.4 million. In the first year, the City would need to purchase 6 collection vehicles (roughly \$1.8M). This would represent a refuse fee of \$528 (\$117 above FY 2020) for the first year for billable households and result in a General Fund subsidy increase of \$161,770 for the non-billable households. Alternatively, the purchase costs of the vehicles could be amortized over multiple years which would reduce the \$117 increase to some degree, but insourcing would still remain materially more expensive. From the second year and on, the cost of recycling collections would be roughly \$1.8M per year, which is \$600,000 more than the current cost of contracted recycling operations. The annual fee would be \$440.34 (\$29.34 above FY 2020) for billable households and a General Fund subsidy increase of \$40,460. This includes the salary and fringe benefits of adding 6 Equipment Operators and 12 Refuse Collectors, capital depreciation of 6 collection trucks, workers compensation, fuel, and vehicle maintenance.

Recycling Crew - 6 Drivers, 6 Trucks, 12 Refuse Collectors		
Program Item	Cost/Description	Total Cost
6 Equipment Operators	\$67,277 (Salary + Fringe) G9 S8	\$ 403,660
12 Refuse Collectors	\$45,057 (Salary and Fringe) G3 S4	\$ 540,684
6 New Collection Truck	\$300,000 each truck	\$ 1,800,000
Capital Depreciation on 6 Collection Trucks	\$40,000 each truck	\$ 240,000
Workers Compensation Costs	\$14,000 per staff for 18 staff	\$ 252,000
Annual Hauling Cost	\$2.20/mile; 100 miles driven/day; 4 days/week; 52 weeks/year per truck for five trucks	\$ 228,800
Vehicle Maintenance / Fleet	Approximately \$17k each truck	\$ 102,000
Year 1 Cost		\$ 3,567,144
Year 1 Difference between In-House & Private	FY21 Household numbers (20,450)	\$ 2,399,040
In House - Year 2 Annual Costs		\$ 1,767,144
Bates Trucking Cost	\$4.76 / month / household (20,450)	\$ 1,168,104
Difference In Annual Costs Post Year 1		\$ 599,040

City of Alexandria, Virginia

FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP

Budget Questions & Answers

March 23, 2020

Question:

What activities are planned to utilize the WasteSmart Implementation Contingency proposed for FY 2021?

Response:

The FY 2020 Approved Budget included cost increases for initiatives in the WasteSmart plan. Those initiatives, which total \$102,846, were incorporated in the refuse fee and remain as a part of the FY 2021 Proposed Budget at the same funding level. Here is a breakdown of the specific initiatives, their estimated costs, and their anticipated benefits:

Operating costs for glass drop off facilities (\$40,000 annually)

o This service covers the operations, labor, education, and disposal costs for the implementation of four glass recycling drop-off facilities across the City. The City removed glass from the single stream bin in January 2020 and anticipates the participation for the purple bin program to grow. Glass collected in purple bins have been transferred to a Fairfax County facility where it will be sent to be recycled into new glass bottles or crushed into aggregate and sand that are used for local public works projects. The City has implemented five containers throughout the City including a partnership with MOM's Organics Market.

Education/Outreach Improvements (\$59,846 annually) include:

o Regional Recycle Right campaign - Participation with regional partners allows the City's investment to go farther. The goal is a decrease in contamination of the recycling stream which will result in a cost reduction for recycling processing. In FY 2020, the Recycle Right regional campaign used streaming radio (Pandora), digital ads on the web, paid social media (Facebook), and broadcast radio. The City of Alexandria had a total of 3,844,479 impressions through this campaign.

o Improved print materials and website (with multi-language translation) - The goal is to reach more residents with details on what material is recyclable and what is not with translations. In FY 2020, the glass mailers that were sent out were translated in Spanish and Amharic. Staff proposes to continue education and outreach efforts to increase awareness and decrease contamination while also increasing accessibility of content.

o Online/app-based sorting game - The goal is to simplify the sorting process and reduce contamination as well as teaching students and the next generation how to sort materials correctly.

Reduce and Reuse Programming (\$3,000)

- o Education and programming to discourage single-use plastic generation such as plastic bags. Plastic bags are one of the top contaminants in the recycling bin, and this program would also serve as an education and outreach opportunity.
- o Online reuse directory of local vendors that provide repair, donate, and consign (second-hand reuse shop) services. The goal is to reduce overall waste in both trash and recycling streams.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 18, 2020

Questions:

1. Can you provide a staffing overview of Parking Enforcement?
2. How many positions does the proposed budget fund?
3. What revenue assumptions are made at that staffing level?
4. What has been our actual staffing history over the past two years?
5. What over hire authority exists and is proposed for parking enforcement in the proposed budget?
6. Can you provide the NET financial impact for the addition of 1, 2, 5 & 10 parking enforcement positions beyond what is proposed by the City Manager?

Responses:

1. The Alexandria Police Department (APD) manages an ongoing hiring process that started in 2018. In late FY 2019, with the support of the City Manager Parking Enforcement Officers (PEO I) were elevated to a grade 10 from a grade 8; PEO II was elevated to a grade 12 from a grade 10; Supervisors were elevated to a grade 15 from a grade 13. This contributed to the improved hiring and retention of the Parking Enforcement Officers.
2. The Alexandria Police Department's Parking Enforcement Unit has an FY 2020 budget for two Parking Enforcement Supervisors and 24 Parking Enforcement Officers. Currently, there is an over hire authority for two Parking Enforcement Officers. There is no proposed change to this for the FY 2021 budget.
3. Through January FY 2020, YTD collections were trending higher compared to the same period last year. Data shows parking enforcement fine revenue was +31% higher compared to the same time last year. This is an adjusted figure reflecting the removal of the vehicle decals. One can attribute this to the increase in Parking Enforcement staffing. The number of citations issued is one factor that has been impacted by the staffing of the unit. However, there are other factors involving fine collection which is outside the responsibility of the Department and its Parking Enforcement Officers. The number of citations issued in February 2020 was up 60% over the lowest point in September 2018. With COVID-19 substantial drop in business in Old Town, it is likely that for the balance of the year that the number of citations issued will drop.

4. Staffing history and fiscal data are provided in table format on the following pages.
The total budgeted and authorized PEO positions are 24.

Positions Filled by Month

2020												
	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Jun</u>	<u>Jul</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
PEO I	10	10	11									
PEO II	10	10	10									
Total Filled	20	20	21	0								
2019												
	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Jun</u>	<u>Jul</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
PEO I	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	9	9	9	10	10
PEO II	12	11	11	11	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Total Filled	19	18	18	18	17	16	16	19	19	19	20	20
2018												
	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Jun</u>	<u>Jul</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
PEO I	11	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	9
PEO II	12	12	12	12	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Total Filled	23	22	22	22	21	21	21	21	21	20	20	20
2017												
	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>Mar</u>	<u>Apr</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>Jun</u>	<u>Jul</u>	<u>Aug</u>	<u>Sep</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>Dec</u>
PEO I	5	5	6	6	9	9	11	12	13	14	12	12
PEO II	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total Filled	18	18	19	19	21	21	23	24	25	26	24	24

5. Budgeted vs. Actual Positions by Fiscal Year

	Budgeted	Actual	Net	Notes
FY20 (As of 7/1/19)	24	21	-3	<i>Authority for 2 Over Hires</i>
FY19 (As of 7/1/18)	24	21	-3	<i>Long unfilled PEO positions removed</i>
FY18 (As of 7/1/17)	29	23	-6	
FY17 (As of 7/1/16)	29	20	-9	<i>5 PEO positions added to budget</i>

Gains vs. Losses by Calendar Year

	Hired	Loss
2020*	5	0
2019	1	6
2018	1	4
2017	12	6
2016	4	10
2015	4	3
2014	1	1
2013	2	0
2012	1	1

**2020 data as of March 2020*

6. Fiscal Impact of Additional Positions

During the FY 2019 budget process, five vacant overhire parking enforcement officer (PEO) positions were removed from the budget due to the fact those positions had not been filled. The Police Department is currently authorized to fill 24.0 FTE PEO positions and two overhire PEOs. The cost of parking enforcement activities includes PEO salary & benefits. Parking Enforcement has handheld devices for 30 PEOs. There are no other equipment requirements.

In FY 2019, parking fine citations produced \$2.7 million in revenue or an estimated \$111,000 per authorized PEO. Based on valid ticket count and average fine for the 8 largest types of violations from FY 2017-2019, each additional PEO is estimated to produce an additional \$107,295¹ in parking fine revenue, however as a result of COVID-19, parking fine revenue has been significantly reduced, and the amount collected per PEO will be significantly less for as long as the crisis continues to impact typical travel and movement patterns within the City. Based strictly on averages, the net fiscal impact of one PEO based on \$107,295 in revenue is \$49,498. However, past experience suggests that adding multiple PEOs would not generate the same multiple of net revenue due to difficulty staffing up to the new FTE level.

¹ Based on updated FY 2021 revenue projections that take into account COVID-19 pandemic impact, estimated parking fine revenue would be \$85,000 per authorized PEO.

Elimination of Windshield Decal Citations

On March 16, 2019, the Alexandria City Council voted unanimously to eliminate the requirement that vehicle owners display a windshield decal to indicate payment of the personal property tax. Current City decals may be removed, and decals will not be issued for future vehicle registrations or renewals. The Police Department no longer issues tickets for failure to display the City/County Vehicle Tag with violation code 10-4-37.

In February 2019, the last month with the requirement that vehicle owners display a windshield decal, the Police Department issued 276 citations with violation code 10-4-37.

February 2019 Total Citations	4,697	
February 2019 Citations 10-4-37	-276	
February 2019 Adjusted Citations	4,421	
		% Change 2019 - 2020
February 2020 Total Citations	5,795	23.4%
February 2020 Citations 10-4-37 *	-4	
February 2020 Adjusted Citations	5,791	31.0%
*Note: Citations issued in error.		

For February 2020, the total citations issued were up 23.4% when compared to February 2019. When the total citations are adjusted to account for the elimination of violation code 10-4-37, citations were up 31.0%.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

March 9, 2020

Question: A memorandum regarding Council Aide compensation and benefits for City Council consideration (City Manager Jinks).

Response: The attached response regarding Council Aide compensation and benefits was prepared by staff and distributed to City Council on March 3, 2020.

Attachment – Memorandum to City Council – Council Aide Compensation and Benefits

Approval

Deputy City Manager: _____

Revise and Publish

City Manager: _____

Revise for Second Review

Date: _____

Re-Write and Submit Again

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 3, 2020

Question: What are the details from Northern Virginia Community College staff on the college's requests for FY 2021 operating and capital assistance?

Response:

Background

The Northern Virginia Community College (NOVA) receives operating and capital budget contributions from nine local jurisdictions, including Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties; and the Cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park. The college's six campuses are located in Annandale, Alexandria, Loudoun County, Manassas, Woodbridge, and Springfield. Funds are provided to NOVA for services and student activities that enable NOVA to operate and maintain the College for the community's use. The City's contribution to NOVA is composed of the following funding sources:

- *Operating Funds:* Annually, NOVA's submits a Local Board Budget request to Northern Virginia jurisdictions. NOVA's College Board uses a formula for a "Local Board Budget" with requests calculated based on participating jurisdictions' populations. For FY 2021, NOVA's request totaled \$250,000 from nine participating jurisdictions. The City's population estimate of 161,050 accounts for 6.4% of the region's total and the requested allocation from the City of Alexandria totaled \$16,009.
- *Capital Funds:* Since 1999, NOVA's supporting jurisdictions have also provided a per capita contribution to the college's capital budget. In FY 2021, the City's share of the regional subsidy to NVCC is \$362,363, or 6.4% percent of the total local capital request of \$5.7 million. Each jurisdiction's share is determined by a formula based on the population of each of the nine participating jurisdictions. FY 2021, the CIP continues the requested rate of growth in the City's contribution at \$2.25 per capita.

FY2021 Budget Request from NOVA

For its FY 2021 budget, NOVA is requesting to re-allocate a share of jurisdictions' capital fund support. While NOVA made this request (attached) last October, the City has no record of previously reviewing it. NOVA states that they will not require that same level of capital commitment since the majority of the college's capital needs for the foreseeable future will be for renovating existing buildings. NOVA is requesting to reduce all jurisdictions' existing \$2.25 per capita contribution by fifty cents to \$1.75 in FY 2021 (**Attachment 1**) and reoccurring in FY 2022 and FY 2023. NOVA proposes redirecting the fifty cent contribution to its operating fund in order to support the creation of an information technology (IT) employment pipeline. If all local jurisdictions comply with this change, the resultant total would be \$1,257,527 in new operating funds that would be used by NOVA to focus on buying down the cost of targeted IT certification exams. For the City of Alexandria, the fifty cents per capita represents \$80,750 in budgeted capital funds. NOVA stated that, depending on the success of this workforce initiative, they may seek similar support in FY 2022 to launch a Healthcare Employment Pipeline. More specifically, NOVA contemplates another 50 cent increase in support in FY 2022 and a \$1.00 increase in FY 2023. This would require additional increases of \$80,750 in the City's FY 2022 budget and \$161,500 in the FY 2023 budget for a cumulative increase of \$242,250.

Recommendation

As proposed, NVCC's request is clearly not intended for capital purposes and supports the transfer of funding to the City's operating budget. City staff would recommend this as a technical adjustment since the change would have an overall neutral impact on the City's General Fund expenditures. This adjustment would require decreasing NVCC's capital and cash capital budget by \$80,750 and increasing NVCC's operating budget by \$80,750. Based on a review of NOVA's request, City staff are supportive of this change and the justification for the usage of funds provided by NOVA in FY 2021, however staff recommends further review of NOVA's requests in the FY 2022 and FY 2023 budget processes.

Attachment

Attachment 1: FY 2021 NVCC Capital Funding Request

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 1, 2020

Question:

What is the comparison of the difference in State education funded between FY 2020 and FY 2021?
What is the impact of any General Assembly adjustments to the FY 2021 budget?

Response:

At the time of preparation of ACPS' Proposed FY 2021 Combined Funds Budget, ACPS projected a 7.2 percent increase in State revenue in FY 2021. Key changes in State funding as proposed by the Virginia Governor for the FY 2021 budget compared with FY 2020 included a \$1.4 million increase in Basic Aid and a \$1.2 million increase in Sales Tax receipts. Since then, the outbreak of COVID-19 is demonstrating significant impacts on local and State revenues. Currently, the impact of Virginia's revenue shortfalls on ACPS is unknown as information from the State is pending. For an initial assessment of COVID-19's impacts on ACPS' revenue sources, please refer to the attached summary prepared by ACPS for the School Board. Although the numbers are not yet known, it is highly likely that the ACPS revenue loss from the State will be substantial and exceed the \$3.56 in federal COVID-19 funds that ACPS has been allocated.

Attachment 1: COVID-19 Impact on ACPS FY 2021 Revenue

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 8, 2020

Question:

Can staff provide a map of where the City recruits from? Please provide the overall job applications in a year.

Response:

The overall number of job applications that the City received for the period from April 1, 2019 to April 1, 2020 was 26,173.

City job advertisements are posted on various sites including, but not limited to, the City website, Indeed.com, GovernmentJobs.com, LinkedIn platform, and various newspaper publications. The City also screens and/or sources candidates from some of these employment-related platforms.

During this fiscal year the Human Resource Department's Deputy Director vacant position was reallocated to a new high-level recruitment manager position in order to increase City resources devoted to recruitment, to become more proactive in recruiting and to increase targeted outreach efforts. This position has been recently filled. The Human Resources Department is currently working on a framework for the City's recruiting efforts to include greater use of the following:

- Colleges and universities
- Technical institutions
- Social media platforms
- Publications
- Job fairs
- Employee referrals

Additionally, the City's recruiting efforts will focus on setting placement goals in target groups with identified underutilization and on building initiatives centered around diversity and inclusion.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 28, 2020

Question:

Of the 177 job classifications reviewed in the General Scale study, what is the range (highest and lowest) and what classification titles are in that range?

Response:

The pay grades of the classifications that were reviewed by the Department of Human Resources in the General Scale study range from pay grades 2 to 28. The pay grades that are currently in use on the General Scale range from grade 2 to 31. The study showed that overall, the General Scale averaged - 4.06% below the market. It has been the City's practice to make overall pay scale changes if a pay scale is more than 5% below the market.

Of the classifications that were studied and analyzed in relation to the FY 2020 pay of the City's comparator jurisdictions, the City's pay ranges lead, align with, or lag the market by the following percentages:

- 18% lead the market (shaded green) at more than 5% above the market
- 43% are at market (not shaded) within a +5% / -5% range of the market
- 39% lag the market (shaded red) at more than 5% below the market

Please, see the attached list of all 177 General Scale classifications showing market deviations for pay range middle points as well as data regarding the number of positions that were included in the classifications that were studied.

It should be noted that the 1.5% General Scale adjustment that was in the City Manager's initial FY 2021 Proposed Budget would have improved the City's competitive position, with that 1.5% pay scale enhancement now removed from the budget due to the COVID-19 related major revenue losses, that competitive gain will not occur.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

May 12, 2020

Question:

Can staff compile exit interview reasons for departing city service by year?

Response:

Exit interviews are used as a tool to find out more about the reasons for why an employee is ending employment with the City and seek suggestions on how to improve the Organization. As part of the exit process, the Department of Human Resources staff obtains feedback from employees who voluntarily terminate their employment and choose to participate in an exit interview. Feedback may also be obtained from employees during the involuntary termination process; however, it is informal and is not included in analyses. Exit interview data is available for the period beginning July 2018.

Table 1 below shows that nearly half (45%) of employees who voluntarily left City government in FY 2020 (year to date) participated in an exit interview; 40% participated in FY 2019. In addition to retirement, the top reason employees cite as motivation for voluntary termination is lack of future career advancement and growth opportunities. As a response to this concern, the City continues investments in professional development opportunities such as tuition assistance and training, and an action plan for addressing turnover is being developed. Other top reported reasons for separation include insufficient work-life balance and dissatisfaction with their management, followed by career change and relocation.

Table 1. Voluntary Termination Exit Interviews		
Reason	FY 2019	FY 2020 YTD
Career Advancement	27	23
Retirement	19	26
Work-Life Balance	19	10
Management	12	14
Career Change	14	7
Relocation	16	4
Other	11	5
Number of Exit Interviews	118	89
Number of Voluntary Terminations	294	200
Percent of Exit Interviews Conducted	40%	45%

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 28, 2020

Question:

Please provide a benefit comparison with comparators similar to slide 7 of the Compensation Work Session.

Response:

Refer to Page 2.

Table 1 below provides information on retirement benefits offered to employees by comparator jurisdictions. Information for the comparator jurisdictions was gathered from publicly available sources.

Table 1 - Retirement Benefits

Jurisdiction	Coverage	Multiplier	Retirement Eligibility	Employee Contribution	Employer Contribution
Alexandria	General Employees, EMT, Fire Marshals (VRS)	Plan 1 – 1.70% Plan 2 – 1.65% Hybrid – 1.00% (only General Employees)	Plan 1 – Age 65 & 5 YOS; Age 50 & 30 YOS Plan 2/Hybrid – Soc. Sec. Full Ret. Age & 5 YOS; Age + YOS = 90	5.00%	8.70%*
	Deputy Sheriffs (VRS-EHDB)	1.70%	Age 60 & 5 YOS Age 50 & 25 YOS	5.00%	8.70%*
	General Employees (City Supplemental)	0.80%	Age 65 & 5 YOS Age 50 & 30 YOS	2.00%	4.16%
	Deputy Sheriffs, EMT, Fire Marshals (City Supplemental)	0.6% (1-5 YOS) 0.9% (6-15 YOS) 1.0% (after 15 YOS)	Age 65 & 5 YOS Age 50 & 25 YOS	0.00% (EMT/FM) 1.50% (Sheriff)	10.50%
	Fire & Police (City F&P Plan)	2.50% 3.20% (after 20 YOS, if hired before 2013)	25 YOS Age 55 & 5 YOS	8.00%	38.30%
Arlington County	General Employees (ACERS)	1.70%	Age + Service = 80 30 YOS Age 62 & 5 YOS	4.00%	14.60%
	Public Safety (ACERS)	2.70%	25 YOS Age 52 & 5 YOS	7.50%	38.70%
Fairfax County	General Employees	2.00%	Age + YOS = 85 (at least age 55)	5.33%	28.35%
	Police Officers	2.80%	25 YOS Age 55	8.65%	41.60%
	Uniformed Plans	2.50%	25 YOS Age 55 & 6 YOS	7.08%	38.44%
Loudoun County	VRS	Plan 1 – 1.70% Plan 2 – 1.65% Hybrid – 1.00% Hazardous Duty – 1.85%	Plan 1 – Age 65 & 5 YOS; Age 50 & 30 YOS Plan 2/Hybrid – Soc. Sec. Full Ret. Age & 5 YOS; Age + YOS = 90	5.00%	10.24%
Montgomery County	General Employees (MCERP)	2.00%	Age 55 & 30 YOS Age 60 & 5 YOS	8.00%	21.28%
	Fire (MCERP)	1.72% (1-20 YOS) 1.38% (21-31 YOS)	20 YOS Age 55 & 15 YOS	7.50%	18.18%
	Police (MCERP)	2.40%	25 YOS Age 55 & 15 YOS	6.75%	18.18%
Prince George's County	General Employees (MSRPS – State Plan)	1.82%	30 YOS Age 62	7.00%	-
	Supplemental County Plan	0.40%	30 YOS; Age 55 & 15 YOS; Age 62 & 5 YOS	3.34% - 5.20%	7.43%
	Uniformed (PG Comprehensive Plan)	3.00% (1-20 YOS) 2.00% (20+ YOS)	Age 55 20 YOS	6.00% (Fire) 10.00% (Sheriff)	41.31% - 62.60%
	Police Officers	3.00% (1-20 YOS) 2.00% (20+ YOS)	Age 55 25 YOS	9.00%	50.64%
Prince William County	VRS	Plan 1 – 1.70% Plan 2 – 1.65% Hybrid - 1.00%	Plan 1 – Age 65 & 5 YOS; Age 50 & 30 YOS Plan 2/Hybrid – Soc. Sec. Full Ret. Age & 5 YOS; Age + YOS = 90	5.00%	12.57%

* VRS employer contribution increased from 7.74% to 8.70% because of the additional enhanced hazardous duty benefits for Deputy Sheriffs.

Table 2 includes information on health insurance coverages offered to employees in the comparator jurisdictions:

Table 2 - Employer-Supported Health Insurance

Jurisdiction	Carriers and Plans	Tiers	Subsidy	Salary-Based	CDHP
Alexandria (FY21)	UHC (EPO, PPO CDHP) Kaiser (DHMO, HMO, CDHP)	4 tiers	Core plans @80%, CDHP @85% Employees and dependents at same level	Employees earning <\$70,000 subsidized at 85%	UHC and Kaiser \$600 Single / \$1,200 Family contribution to HSA
Arlington County (no changes in FY21)	Cigna (3 Open Access PPOs) Kaiser (HMO)	4 tiers	Core Plans @80% for employees, 75% for dependents	N/A	N/A
Fairfax County (CY20)	Cigna (2 Open Access PPOs, CDHP) Kaiser (HMO)	4 tiers	Core Plans @85% for employees, 75% for dependents	N/A	Cigna \$700 Single / \$1,400 Family contribution to HSA
Loudoun County (CY20)	Cigna (POS, Open Access PPO, CDHP with HSA and HRA)	3 tiers	Varies by Plan 95%-85% for employees, 90%-75% for dependents	N/A	Cigna \$1,000 Single / \$2,000 Family contribution to HSA or HRA
Montgomery County (CY20)	UHC (Low and High POS, HMO with 3 Rx Plans) Kaiser (HMO)	3 tiers	HMO plans @ 80%, POS Plans @75% Employees and dependents at same level	N/A	N/A
Prince George's County (CY20)	Cigna (PPO, HMO) Kaiser (HMO)	3 tiers	HMO plans @75%, PPO @70% Employees and dependents at same level	N/A	N/A
Prince William County (no changes in FY21)	Anthem (2 Open Access PPOs, HMO) Kaiser (HMO)	4 tiers	HMO Plans @95% for employees, 75% for dependents; Core PPO Plan @90% for employee, 70% for dependents	N/A	N/A

Table 3 provides information on leave and disability benefits for the comparator jurisdictions including annual leave, paid parental leave, paid holidays, sick leave, and short-term (STD) and long-term disability (LTD):

Table 3 - Leave and Disability Benefits

Jurisdiction	Leave	Paid Parental Leave	Holidays	Disability
Alexandria	Annual - 13 days first year, add 1 day/yr up to 25 days	6 weeks to use in 6 months	11 paid holidays per year and President Inauguration Day	Sick pay - 12 days/yr, Sick Leave Bank, LTD - 60% at 120 days, buy-up to 90 days
Arlington County	Annual - 13 days first year, add 1 day/yr up to 26 days	4 weeks	10 fixed and 1 floating paid holidays per year	Sick pay - 13 days/yr, LTD - 66 2/3% at 90 days to one year
Fairfax County	Annual - 13 days first year, add 6 hours/yr after 3 years up to 26 days	2 weeks	10 paid holidays per year	Sick pay - 13 days/yr, LTD - 60% at 60 days, buy-up to 90 days
Loudoun County	Annual - 12 days first year, add 1 day/yr after 2 years up to 24 days	N/A	11.5 fixed and 1 floating paid holidays per year	Sick pay - 12 days/yr, STD - 60% (based on VRS Plan), LTD - 60% to VRS retirement, buy-up benefit to normal retirement date
Montgomery County	Annual - 15 days first 3 years, 20 days years 4-15, 26 days at 15 years of service	Annual/sick/sick leave bank up to 24 months after birth (total of 720 hours)	9 paid holidays per year	Combination of annual/sick/sick leave bank
Prince George's County	Annual - 12 days first 3 years, 19.5 days years 4-16, 26 days at 16 years of service	N/A	13.5 paid holidays per year	Sick pay - 12 days per year, LTD - Employee Paid (benefit is tax free) 50% or 60% after 180 days
Prince William County	Annual - 13 days first 3 years, add 1 day every 3 years	N/A	12 paid holidays per year	Sick pay - 13 days, Hybrid employees in State-mandated STD and LTD

Table 4 presents information on dental, vision, life insurance, and other benefits offered by comparator jurisdictions:

Table 4 - Dental, Vision, Life Insurance, and Other Benefits

Jurisdiction	Dental	Vision	Life Insurance	Other
Alexandria	Aetna DMO and PPO	Aetna PPO	Hired <7/1/08 - 2x pay, Hired >7/1/08 - 1x pay, Supplemental - 1x or 2x, LOD for Public Safety to \$200,000	Virgin Pulse up to \$600, Mass transit - \$100/mo
Arlington County	Delta Dental Standard and Premium PPO	Discounts on exams, glasses and contacts	Basic - 1x pay Supplemental available	Mass transit - \$180/mo, Day Care 25% discount Adoption \$5,000, Onsite Health Clinic
Fairfax County	Delta Dental PPO	EyeMed	Basic - 1x pay Supplemental - 1x - 4x pay	LiveWell up to \$200
Loudoun County	Delta Dental PPO	Davis Vision	VRS Basic - 2x pay and Optional Life - 1x - 4x pay	Cigna Wellness up to \$250
Montgomery County	Cigna DMO and PPO	EyeMed	Basic - 1x pay Supplemental - 1x - 8x pay	Virgin Pulse up to \$350, Mass transit - \$75/mo
Prince George's County	Aetna DMO and PPO	VSP Base and Buy-up	Basic -2x pay (opt down to 1x), Supplemental - 1x - 4x pay, Public Safety - 50x monthly pay to \$300,000	UNUM Whole Life, Group Accident, STD, Critical Illness, AFLAC Dental, Legal Resources and Shield
Prince William County	Delta Dental Core and Enhanced PPO	VSP Signature Plan	VRS Basic - 2x pay and Optional Life - 1x - 4x pay	Voluntary STD Plan

Glossary of Select Terms, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

3 Tiers - Include Employee Only, Employee + 1, Employee + Family

4 Tiers - Include Employee Only, Employee + 1, Employee + Child(ren), Employee + Family

ACERS - Arlington County Employees Retirement System

CDHP - Consumer-directed Healthcare Plan

DHMO - Deductible Health Maintenance Organization insurance plan

DMO - Dental Maintenance Organization insurance plan

EMT - Emergency Medical Technicians (Fire Medics)

EPO - Exclusive Provider Organization insurance plan

HMO - Health Maintenance Organization insurance plan

LTD - Long-term Disability

MCERP - Montgomery County Employee Retirement Plans

MSRPS - Maryland State Retirement and Pension System

PPO - Preferred Provider Organization insurance plan

STD - Short-term Disability

UHC - UnitedHealthcare

VRS - Virginia Retirement System

VRS-EHDB - VRS Enhanced Hazardous Duty Benefit retirement plan

YOS - Years of Service

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 21, 2020

Question:

What is the total number of Special Merit pays provided last year?

Response:

Based on FY 2019 payroll reports, the City awarded 422 Outstanding Service Awards and Special Merit Bonus Pays to 363 City employees. The total amount of these special merit pays was \$379,215 with the average award of \$899.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

March 23, 2020

Question:

What is the breakdown of health insurance covered lives (employees, spouses, dependents)?
 How many employees/covered lives use Kaiser? United HealthCare?
 How many employees currently opt out of health care coverage? If available, do we have the reason they opt out?

Response:

Tables 1 and 2 below represent the breakdown of active participation and the breakdown of dependents by health insurance carrier:

Table 1 - Active Participation						Table 2 - Dependents	
	Employees	Percent	Family Size	Dependents	Total Members	Spouse	Children
United Healthcare	1,177	60%	2.06	1,248	2,425	460	788
Kaiser Permanente	791	40%	2.04	823	1,614	308	515
Total	1,968			2,071	4,039	768	1,303

The total number of eligible employees is 2,317, of which 349 (15.1% of all eligible employees) have elected to opt out from the City-provided health insurance coverage. Primary reasons for employee opt-outs has historically been enrollment in health insurance coverage through spouse, coverage for military members, retirees, and dependents, and coverage through Medicaid.

Of the active employees, 224 are projected to take advantage of the new Employee + Child(ren) coverage tier.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

May 1, 2020

Question:

Please provide a history of retiree life insurance changes.

Response:

The following table outlines the history of life insurance rate changes over the last ten years as well as the rate changes over the next three fiscal years (highlighted). Basic Life is the life insurance coverage provided by the City at no cost to employees and Additional Life is the voluntary life insurance coverage at additional cost that employees may elect.

	Life Insurance Rate History and FY21-FY23 Renewal Rates per \$1,000					
	Basic Life			Additional Life		
		Active			Active	
	Employees	Retirees		Employees	Retirees	
November 30, 2009	\$ 0.180	\$ 0.180	\$ 0.180	\$ 0.180	\$ 0.180	
December 1, 2009	\$ 0.198	\$ 0.198	\$ 0.198	\$ 0.198	\$ 0.198	
December 1, 2011	\$ 0.240	\$ 0.240	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.242	
March 1, 2015	\$ 0.283	\$ 0.283	\$ 0.286	\$ 0.286	\$ 0.286	
July 1, 2017	\$ 0.325	\$ 0.325	\$ 0.286	\$ 0.286	\$ 0.286	
July 1, 2020	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.286	
July 1, 2021	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.330	
July 1, 2022	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.381	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.242	\$ 0.395	

The policy changed on July 1, 2009, to grandfather the life insurance benefits (2x Basic Life and up to 2x Additional Life coverage continued into retirement) for employees hired before that date. New hires after that date received a 1x pay Basic Life coverage and could still elect up to 2x Additional Life, but no coverage could be continued into retirement.

As shown in the rate history, the City has had the same active employee and retiree rates for Basic Life and Additional Life coverages respectively. Inherently, due to differences in risk levels of these two target groups, this means the active employee rate has subsidized the retiree rate. As a result, active employees have been purchasing consistently less Additional Life coverage over the last 8 years (from 1,145 employees to 648) and retirees have been purchasing more (from 384 to 590). This year’s renewal required a 15.5% overall premium increase due to a 230% loss ratio for Retiree Basic Life and 266% loss ratio for Retiree Additional Life.

The life insurance company the City partners with offered an option to help stabilize the program and lower the overall renewal costs by reducing the active rate and allowing employees to purchase one additional level of coverage without proof of good health at the FY21 Open Enrollment. The retiree Additional Life rate was proposed to increase rates to reflect the higher risk level over a 3-year period (offset partially by a lower imputed income cost).

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
 FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
 Budget Questions & Answers**

May 1, 2020

Question:

Please provide a history of past compensation studies for DCHS, T&ES, RPCA, and DGS job classifications.

Response:

The following table includes the history of the primary compensation studies over the last 5 years and includes information on when the study was conducted, the affected departments, and study type.

Date	Department	Study Name/Type
FY15/Q2	All	Benchmark Study
FY17/Q2	All	Benchmark Study
FY17/Q3	DGS	Capital Projects Classifications
FY18/Q1	DCHS	Study of Psychologist-Psychiatrist Classifications
FY18/Q1	DCHS	Opioid Response Program
FY18/Q2	All	Benchmark Study
FY18/Q2	T&ES	T&ES Inspector Classification Series
FY19/Q2	All	Benchmark Study
FY19/Q4	DCHS	Caseworker/Therapists
FY20/Q2	All	Market Study by Outside Consultant
FY20/Q2	T&ES	Transportation Technology Data Analyst
FY20/Q2	DGS	Energy Manager Classification
FY20/Q3	T&ES, RPCA, and DGS	Equipment Operators & Heavy Equipment Operators
FY20/Q4	DCHS	Division of Economic Support (Human Services Benefits Classifications)
FY20/Q4	T&ES	Trade Worker Classifications

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

March 19, 2020

Question:

Please provide budget comments submitted online regarding the FY 2021 Proposed Budget.

Response:

Comment # 8

To: Yon Lambert, Director, Dept. of Transportation & Environmental Services Bob Williams, Division Chief, Natural Resources Gloria Sitton, City Clerk and Clerk of Council Re: King Street corridor from 395 to Quaker Lane Da: March 5, 2020 I am the President of Fairlington Glen which borders Alexandria at the corner of King Street and Quaker Lane. Our residents shop and eat at the Alexandria establishments in Bradlee Center and Centre Plaza. We were delighted when the City decided to beautify Quaker Lane by installing plantings along the median near the King Street interchange. And we appreciate you keeping the plantings trimmed so they do not block visibility for cars and pedestrians entering Quaker Lane from 36th Street. We understand that the City is evaluating the need for storm water management and landscape improvements along the King Street corridor. Judging by the declining health of the trees in the median between 395 and Quaker Lane, improvements in soil, water disbursement, and plantings are definitely needed. The Glen has also noticed a decline in the health of our trees inside the fence along King Street over the past few years. As we are below the level of King Street, it is possible that water, winter chemicals, etc. may be draining down onto our property and adding to the deterioration of our trees. King Street is a major thoroughfare and deserves your highest consideration in resolving the storm water issues so landscaping improvements can commence. The condition and appearance of King Street is not only important to Fairlington residents but also to enticing people to shop at the Alexandria businesses along this main roadway.

Comment # 9

I live in Fairlington, and we are regular shoppers over at Bradlee Shopping Center. The stretch of property from Quaker Lane and I395 is in dire need of improvements. Stormwater management is a problem here – in the winter runoff collects in the ditches and looks bad, and in the summer the standing water is a source of mosquitoes. In addition, trash collects on the standing water and looks bad as well. The trees along the median also are in terrible shape – they look damaged or diseased. Stormwater management needs to be improved, and both for stormwater management and appearance, landscaping is needed – preferably with native trees, shrubs, and plants suited to this difficult location. I am writing to request that funding for improvements is included in the City's operating budget and Capital Improvement Program (CIP), as well as to request that the City work with grantors to secure grant funds to lower the costs.

Comment # 10

Currently, rainwater and snow melt from the King Street roadway and nearby areas run into ditches and low-lying areas that can be unsightly after large precipitation events. Pooled water catches and holds windblown trash. In warm weather, stagnant water in the ditches breeds mosquitos. Modern stormwater Best Management Practices can catch and filter rainwater, capture pollutants that would

enter the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay, and greatly improve the appearance of this area. In addition, Route 7 in this area is a gateway to Alexandria. Don't you want the city to put its best foot forward by making this area attractive? Please include funding in the budget to make this happen.

Comment # 11

Dear Mayor Wilson and Council Members: I am writing to comment on City Manager's proposed annual operating budget for FY21 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2021-2030. I respectfully request that the City of Alexandria provide funding to address long-delayed stormwater management and landscaping improvements along King Street from North Quaker Lane to I-395. Adequate funding should be provided in both the City's operating budget and the CIP. Here is a quick description of the existing situation along King Street. Rainwater and snow melt from King Street and nearby areas runs into ugly ditches and low-lying areas that are unsightly after large rain/snow events. Pooled water catches and holds windblown trash. In warm weather, stagnant water in the ditches breeds mosquitos. The old, ugly stormwater ditches date from another time. Modern stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) can catch and filter rainwater and capture pollutants that would enter the Potomac and the Chesapeake Bay. BMPs would greatly improve the appearance of this area. Examples of BMPs can be seen at: <https://chesapeakestormwater.net/training-library/stormwater-bmps/>. Alexandria staff have made presentations in our community and have described the beautiful and effective stormwater structures that can be installed along King Street to solve the stormwater collection problems. The landscape along King Street is also in serious need of attention. Many trees along the roadway are badly damaged, stunted, or in poor health. This "western gateway" to Alexandria should be a beautiful urban landscape with large canopy trees and plantings of flowers and native plants. It should be an area the entire city is proud of. We are aware that the city plans to spend approximately 6.1 million on stream restorations of Strawberry and Taylor Runs. Spending far less, the city could improve stormwater management along King Street, capture stormwater runoff and the pollutants that enter Taylor Run, and make King Street a beautiful urban landscape. I invite you to work with residents and homeowner organizations in both Arlington and Alexandria to make the vision described above a reality. Working together we believe something truly beautiful can be accomplished. Thank you for considering my comments.

Comment # 12

Please seriously consider funding for storm water and landscape improvements along the King Street-from Quaker Lane corridor. It is ugly, desolate, neglected. Surely Alexandria can do better than to keep this blight on our landscape. It could become an attractive gateway to the West Alex development. Won't you beautify our neighborhood! And work with the concerned communities who support this initiative.

Comment # 13

I am writing to express the views of the Fairlington Citizens Association (FCA), the civic association that represents more than 7400 households in the City of Alexandria and Arlington County, on the City Manager's proposed annual operating budget for FY21 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2021-2030. We urge you to include adequate funding in the budget and CIP to address long-delayed stormwater management and landscaping improvements along King Street from North Quaker Lane to the I-395 intersection. The King Street corridor from Quaker Lane to the I-395 interchange, which includes the drainage ditch between King Street and the access road next to the Bradlee Shopping Center, suffers from poor drainage, frequent trash, and damaged trees. This area has previously been identified as a potential site for Right of Way retrofits as part of the City's larger stormwater management plan. Rainwater from King Street and nearby areas runs into ditches and low-lying areas

along King Street and the adjacent service road, collecting pollutants that ultimately make their way into the Chesapeake Bay. These ditches are unsightly after large rain and snow events. Pooled water catches and holds windblown trash. In warmer months, the stagnant water in the ditches breeds mosquitos. Technical staff from the City's Department of Transportation and Environmental Services (DTES) have told us that best management practices for managing stormwater can be installed along King Street to catch and filter rainwater. These practices will remove pollutants that would otherwise enter the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay and they would greatly improve the appearance of this area. We understand that the main impediment to implementing this work is the fact that funding for it is not identified within the current CIP. The King Street corridor will also benefit from landscaping improvements. Many trees in the King Street median and along the roadway are damaged, overgrown with vines, or in poor health. (We appreciate the recent actions by staff to address some of the immediate issues.) This "western gateway" to Alexandria could be an especially beautiful urban landscape with large canopy trees and plantings of flowers and native plants. Fairlington residents have made several presentations before the Alexandria Beautification Commission asking that the city move forward with landscape improvements. The Commission was supportive but said it was powerless to propose beautification improvements until DTES determines if stormwater projects will be constructed in the area. We believe both stormwater and landscape improvements are needed. For several years, residents of Fairlington, joined by Fairlington area gardening organizations and homeowner associations, have worked to improve the appearance of this corridor, have invested considerable volunteer hours in picking up litter, and have communicated with City staff about the need for landscape and stormwater management improvements along this part of King Street. The effort to enhance this part of Alexandria's boundary--and make it a more welcoming introduction to the City--has enjoyed significant citizen engagement. What it now needs are the financial resources to address the underlying drainage and landscaping issues. Accordingly, we respectfully ask that the operating budget and CIP program provide adequate resources to improve this important corridor. FCA believes that these King Street improvements could provide a model of good urban landscape design, integrating strong environmental practices with attractive landscaping. We stand ready to work with the City in implementing these strategies.

Comment # 14

I strongly oppose property tax rate increases at this point. I think the city should find place to saves rather than raise taxes. It's a double hit - both increased assessments and an increased rate, all in one year. The money makes a difference even for high income people - that's less money to eat out, shop, and spend in the local community. I can't even imagine how oppressive this is to lower income people trying to hold onto houses they might have owned for decades, with rapidly increasing assessments. Also it can't be ignored that many residents are over the \$10,000 cap on federally deductible local taxes, so this money is also subject to federal income tax too. This city collects plenty of tax revenue, and will get more from new development and continuously increasing property values. I see no evidence of any efforts at fiscal restraint before determining a tax increase is absolutely necessary. I wish the city would prioritize lowering taxes (vehicle taxes too!) not raising them. We have a fine city with great services, but something has to give here or people will keep choosing to live in north Arlington instead of here. (Property tax rate there is 1.026% and they also have better schools and similar services.)

Comment # 15

I am writing to you as the President of Fairlington Mews Condominium Association. Our association borders King Street in Alexandria from intersection of S. Wakefield St. in Arlington to the entrance ramp of I-395 on the south side of the overpass. Our association recently spent over \$60,000 to clean up the appearance of this area along the roadside. We removed an unsightly dying hedge, installed a new

wooden fence to replace a chain link one and removed many pounds of trash hiding behind the hedge. We are currently maintaining the grass on the King Street side of our wooden fence and continuing to clean up litter thrown from cars along this area (even though that property belongs to the city of Alexandria) because we take pride in our neighborhood. I was disappointed to hear that the City Manager's proposed annual operating budget for FY21 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2021-2030 is not addressing this area along with the sections of King Street bordering Fairlington Arbor and Fairlington Glen all the way to Quaker Lane. I respectfully request that the City of Alexandria provide funding to address long-delayed stormwater management and landscaping improvements along King Street from North Quaker Lane to I-395. Adequate funding should be provided in both the City's operating budget and the CIP. King Street East off of I-395 is heavily used by an ever-increasing population. We are also the first thing the tourists see as they travel east on King Street after getting off I-395 heading towards Old Town. The landscape along King Street needs some attention. Many trees along the roadway are badly damaged, stunted, or in poor health. Please consider improving the appearance of this area and let us know what we can do to help. Thanks for your consideration.

Comment # 16

As the economy craters, I am stunned by the City Council's blithe disregard of the consequences of a tax increase for Alexandria residents with middle incomes. Please stop and reconsider. That you do not view a \$400-500 per household tax increase to be significant indicates how out of touch you are with your constituents. The rise in property values only puts more money in your pocket if you sell and leave the city. I encourage you to explore addressing the educational needs of Alexandria children and youth by consolidating Alexandria's school system with the larger and higher-performing Arlington or Fairfax County school systems. A municipality as small as Alexandria does not need its own school system, particularly when we get the outcomes we've been getting from Alexandria Public Schools. Consolidating our schools with those of Arlington or Fairfax County will save us money and better serve our children.

Comment # 17

Hello City Council Members - I am against a property tax increase for the next fiscal year. With the news that the home valuations went up considerably on Jan 1, 2020, the City is already seeing an enormous increase in tax revenue. Raising the tax rate on top of this seems greedy and highly questionable.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 8, 2020

Question:

Update of the summary pay comparator charts showing the results of the compensation recommendations included in the proposed budgets.

Response:

The charts on the following pages depict pay comparisons based on the FY 2021 original proposed budgets. The comparator charts reflect the pay comparisons based on the following:

- The results of the Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study, which depict comparison of average midpoints for approved FY 2020 pay ranges for both the City of Alexandria and the comparator jurisdictions. These results are in Column "FY 2020 Benchmark Study" of each chart.
- Comparison of the compensation enhancements in the City of Alexandria's originally proposed FY 2021 budget against the FY 2020 compensation in the comparator jurisdictions. This comparison of average midpoints is included in the Column labeled "FY 2021 Alexandria Proposals".
- Pay comparison based on the compensation changes as originally proposed in the City of Alexandria's and the comparator jurisdictions' FY 2021 budgets. The results of this comparison of average midpoints is in Column "FY 2021 Comparator Proposals".

With Budget revision 2.0, these compensation changes originally proposed, including the 1.5% pay scale increase, have been eliminated in the FY 2021 budget due to the ongoing public health crisis and one resulting in a dramatic drop in revenues.

It should be noted that most, if not nearly all, of the proposed compensation enhancements by the City's comparator jurisdictions have been (or will be) eliminated in the budget to be adopted by these jurisdictions due to the impact of COVID-19 on local revenues, so pay differentials will stay roughly as shown under the FY 2020 Benchmark Study column in the following pages.

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Police

Based on the results of the Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study, Police Captains and Police Lieutenants show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City's target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all classifications aligns with the market.

After accounting for the 1.5% increase to the pay scale and targeted increases of two grades each for Police Captains and Police Lieutenants included in the City’s originally proposed FY 2021 budget, all classifications on the police pay scale would be aligned with the midpoint of the market, and the average deviation from the midpoint would exceed the average by 0.02%.

After applying the City’s proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale and targeted increases of two grades each for Police Captains and Police Lieutenants and accounting for the originally proposed FY21 compensation changes in the comparator jurisdictions, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -2.40%.

Classification Title	FY20 Benchmark Study	FY21 Alexandria Proposals	FY21 Comparator Proposals
POLICE CAPTAIN	-9.86%	1.82%	-1.32%
POLICE LIEUTENANT	-10.21%	1.25%	-1.99%
POLICE SERGEANT	-1.78%	-0.28%	-4.62%
DETECTIVE III*	-	-	-
DETECTIVE II*	-	-	-
DETECTIVE I	-0.06%	1.42%	1.42%
POLICE OFFICER IV	-3.03%	-1.51%	-4.62%
POLICE OFFICER III	-2.47%	-0.96%	-1.96%
POLICE OFFICER II	-5.02%	-3.46%	-6.68%
POLICE OFFICER I	0.38%	1.85%	0.59%
Average Midpoint Deviation	-4.01%	0.02%	-2.40%

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Sheriff

Based on the results of the Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study, Chief Deputy Sheriff’s, Deputy Sheriff Captains and Deputy Sheriff Lieutenants show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City’s target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all classifications aligns with the market.

After accounting for the 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Chief Deputy Sheriff to the executive pay scale, and applying targeted increases of one grade for Deputy Sheriff Captains and Deputy Sheriff Lieutenants as included in the City’s originally proposed FY 2021 budget, all classifications on the sheriff pay scale would be aligned with the midpoint of the market and the average deviation from the midpoint exceeds the average by 0.46%.

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Chief Deputy Sheriff to the executive pay scale, and applying targeted increases of one grade for Deputy Sheriff Captains and

Deputy Sheriff Lieutenants and accounting for the originally proposed FY21 compensation changes in the comparator jurisdictions, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -3.33%.

Classification Title	FY20 Benchmark Study	FY21 Alexandria Proposals	FY21 Comparator Proposals
CHIEF DEPUTY SHERIFF**	-20.17%	-	-
DEPUTY SHERIFF - CAPTAIN	-4.28%	2.15%	-1.65%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - LIEUTENANT	-6.28%	0.00%	-3.92%
DEPUTY SHERIFF - SERGEANT	-1.61%	-0.11%	-3.73%
DEPUTY SHERIFF IV	-0.72%	0.77%	-4.25%
DEPUTY SHERIFF III	-3.57%	-2.04%	-3.43%
DEPUTY SHERIFF II	0.04%	1.52%	-3.65%
DEPUTY SHERIFF I	-0.56%	0.92%	-2.70%
Average Midpoint Deviation	-4.64%	0.46%	-3.33%

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Fire

Based on the results of the Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study, Deputy Fire Chief’s and Firefighter I’s show the most significant deviation from the midpoint of the market that exceeds the City’s target of aligning with the average of the market (+/-5% of the average). Despite some classifications deviating from the average of the market, the average deviation of all classifications aligns with the market.

After accounting for the 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Deputy Fire Chief to the executive pay scale, and applying a targeted increase of one grade for Firefighter I’s as included in the City’s originally proposed FY 2021 budget, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -1.52%.

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale, moving the Deputy Fire Chief to the executive pay scale, and applying a targeted increase of one grade for Firefighter I’s and accounting for the originally proposed FY21 compensation changes in the comparator jurisdictions, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -4.39%.

Classification Title	FY20 Benchmark Study	FY21 Alexandria Proposals	FY21 Comparator Proposals
DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF**	-12.18%	-	-
FIRE BATTALION CHIEF	-3.43%	-1.90%	-3.86%
FIRE CAPTAIN	-2.93%	-1.41%	-3.23%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	-1.64%	-0.14%	-1.94%
FIRE FIGHTER IV	4.50%	5.91%	4.13%
FIRE FIGHTER III***	-9.15%	-7.54%	-9.75%
FIRE FIGHTER II	-4.31%	-2.77%	-
FIRE FIGHTER I	-9.52%	-2.77%	-11.71%
Average Midpoint Deviation	-4.83%	-1.52%	-4.39%

Public Safety Pay Competitiveness: Fire Marshals/Medics

Based on the results of the Traditional Comparator Benchmark Study, classifications on the Fire Marshal/Medic pay scales meet or exceed the average midpoint in the market.

After accounting for the 1.5% increase to the pay scale as included in the City's originally proposed FY 2021 budget, classifications on this pay scale continue to meet or exceed the average of the market, with the average deviation from the midpoint exceeding the average by 7.95%. As noted below there are substantial positive deviations for single-role medics. This statistic is not meaningful as there are few single role medic positions in the DC region as nearly all of the region is on a dual role status.

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale and accounting for the originally proposed FY21 compensation changes in the comparator jurisdictions, classifications on this pay scale continue to meet or exceed the average of the market, with the average deviation from the midpoint exceeding the average by 7.41%.

Classification Title	FY20 Benchmark Study	FY21 Alexandria Proposals	FY21 Comparator Proposals
ASSISTANT FIRE MARSHAL	8.41%	9.76%	8.25%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL III	-2.94%	-1.42%	-3.01%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL II	5.03%	6.43%	6.43%
DEPUTY FIRE MARSHAL I	4.00%	5.42%	5.42%
EMS OPERATIONS MANAGER	7.44%	8.81%	8.81%
FIRE LIEUTENANT	-	-	-
EMS CAPTAIN/SUPERVISOR	7.97%	9.33%	9.33%
MEDIC IV	6.86%	8.23%	6.49%
MEDIC III	9.55%	10.89%	10.89%
MEDIC II	12.82%	14.11%	14.11%
Average Midpoint Deviation	6.57%	7.95%	7.41%

General Schedule Pay Competitiveness

The average deviation of benchmarked classifications on the general pay scale are currently aligned with the average of the midpoint of the market at -4.06% (within +/-5% of the average).

After accounting for the 1.5% increase to the pay scale as included in the City's originally proposed FY 2021 budget, the average deviation from the midpoint is aligned with the average at -2.52%.

After applying the proposed 1.5% increase to the pay scale and accounting for the originally proposed FY21 compensation changes in the comparator jurisdictions, the average deviation from the midpoint falls within +/-5% of the average at -4.26%.

	FY20 Benchmark Study	FY21 Alexandria Proposals	FY21 Comparator Proposals
North Virginia Comparator Benchmark Study Average for Included General Schedule Job Classes	-4.06%	-2.52%	-4.26%

* No equivalent matches identified in the comparator market.

**Classification is proposed to move to the Executive pay scale.

***Does not reflect additional 3% in specialty pay that is provided in addition to the base pay rate.

City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers

April 29, 2020

Question:

Regarding Medicaid revenue collections, how does the City of Alexandria compare with neighboring jurisdictions? Is there any additional Medicaid revenue that could be collected?

(Mayor Wilson and Councilman Aguirre)

Response:

The City of Alexandria collected approximately 76% of Medicaid revenue in FY 2019. This compares to Loudoun County who collected 74% of Medicaid revenue, Prince William County at 82%, and Arlington County at 80%. The Loudoun County collection rate increased by 14% in six months (to 88%) after hiring full-time staff to handle appeals and denials associated with claims. In the current FY 2020, the City of Alexandria has increased Medicaid revenue collection to 82% of potential revenue due to the addition of temporary staff and the improvement of documentation and follow-up protocols.

In FY 2021, the City of Alexandria's Medicaid revenue collection is projected to increase to a rate of 86% or above with the addition of two permanent staff. These two additional staff will assist in ensuring revenue maximization by focusing on appeals and denials. They will also focus on completing pre-authorization and eligibility screening, which are the most critical elements in fully collecting Medicaid revenue. The increase in revenue collection could help offset State-mandated budget cuts and bring in additional collections of approximately \$500,000.

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JULY 10, 2020

TO: THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL

FROM: MARK B. JINKS, CITY MANAGER 

SUBJECT: BUDGET MEMO #58: TAYLOR RUN STREAM RESTORATION

On March 27, 2020, Members of City Council and the City Manager received an email message from Mr. Russell Bailey (see Attachment #1) regarding the Taylor Run Stream Restoration capital project. Subsequently, Mayor Wilson requested a budget memo to provide background on this project and to respond to the issues/concerns raised by Mr. Bailey. The format of this memo is to pull quotes or paraphrases from Mr. Bailey's email to create a series of "comments" followed by a City staff written "response."

Background

The City's Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Action Plan identifies urban stream restoration as a cost-effective strategy that protects and enhances local water quality and the environment while addressing state and federal mandates to clean up the Bay by reducing nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollution from urban stormwater runoff through three successive 5-year cycles of the City's municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit. The City met the requirement to reduce pollution by at least 5% at the end of the 2013 – 2018 permit. The current 2018 – 2023 permit requires the City to reduce pollution by a total 40%, with 100% achieved by the end of the 2023 – 2028 permit. Recently, the City 'retrofitted' Lake Cook to increase pollutant removal efficiencies while enhancing wildlife habitat and creating additional recreational amenities for the public. The Ben Brenman Pond Retrofit is currently underway and nearing completion with the same multiple benefits for the public and the environment. Like the City's current urban stream restoration projects that are being designed, these regional pond retrofits projects received Stormwater Local Assistance Fund (SLAF) matching grant funding from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ).

1. Comment: *Given that the restoration is not necessary to meet Alexandria's current Chesapeake Bay pollution reduction obligations, deferral of the project would be a good cost reduction step in the current budget revision.*

Response: Given that pollution reduction requirements increase significantly with each MS4 permit, the City adopted more aggressive internal targets, evidenced by the Bay Pollution Reduction Goal of 45% by FY 2021 in the City's Strategic Plan. To comply with the MS4 permit mandate, the City is currently working on three separate urban stream restoration projects – Lucky Run, Strawberry Run, and Taylor Run – that have received matching SLAF grant funding from VDEQ as

one of the most cost-effective practices to reduce pollution in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

The Taylor Run Stream Restoration total project cost of \$4.45M has been awarded a 50/50 matching SLAF grant of \$2.225M from VDEQ, with the City match portion coming from prior allocated funds from the Stormwater Utility fee, which is a dedicated source that by Virginia Code can only be used for stormwater management.

Per the protocols approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program using site-specific data as discussed below, and discussed in the City's Chesapeake Bay Action Plan, the Taylor Run Stream Restoration project will reduce about 300 lbs. of phosphorus pollution at an overall cost of about \$14,800/lb. or about \$7,400/lb. just considering the City's cost share. By contrast, the total project cost for the Lake Cook Retrofit of about \$4.5M and Ben Brenman at \$3.8M will achieve about 160 lbs. and 150 lbs. respectively at a cost of about \$28,000/lb. and \$25,000/lb. respectively. These projects were chosen for the cost benefit with respect to water quality and the environmental benefits, as well as the quality of life benefits offered by these projects.

The City has a limited number of opportunities for these types of large-scale projects that are very cost-effective and address state and federal mandates while delivering community benefits. Cost estimates for smaller scale stormwater best management practices (BMPs) retrofits were derived by the City during initial planning for the Bay TMDL. These estimates were based on best engineering practices, local assumptions, discussions with regional partners, literature research, and anecdotal data derived for the installation of these BMPs during redevelopment in the City. Estimates for these smaller scale BMPs is about \$55,000 to \$75,000/lb. of phosphorus. So, by comparison, deferring the Taylor Run Stream Restoration with a total project cost of \$4.45M to construct smaller scale BMPs to achieve the same reduction, the City would need to spend about \$16.5M to \$22.5M while Taylor Run would not be restored and continue to degrade.

2. Comment: *I have been concerned that the proposed stream restoration project for Taylor Run Valley may have greater environmental and "quality of life" costs than benefits.*

Response: Urban stream restoration benefits include stabilization of impacted streams, restoration of stream ecology, protection of critical infrastructure as applicable, and enhancement of aquatic and terrestrial habitat, by employing natural channel design techniques approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Urban stream restoration stops the environmental degradation from development, enhances stream and terrestrial ecology, and affords enjoyment of the restored ecosystem. City staff from Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES); Recreation, Parks, and Cultural Activities (RPCA); and the Department of Project Implementation (DPI), working with the City's environmental consultant, sought to maximize environmental benefits of the project will minimizing impacts to the ecology. Through public outreach and successive iterations of ongoing design, the project

minimizes impacts to identified matured trees and avoids impacts to the wetlands delineated with the assistance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the consultant's wetland scientist. The pollutant removal effectiveness of the stream restoration depends on the restoration of the stream ecosystem. Without stream restoration, accelerated erosion of the bed and banks will continue and even more trees will be undermined and lost as evidenced by the great number of exposed roots and fallen trees within the stream corridor.

3. Comment: *According to a City fact sheet, the project would reduce phosphorus and nitrogen runoff by 30 percent and 9 percent respectively. These numbers, however, were reached not by a site-specific analysis but by the application of a generic formula. Thus, the actual pollution reduction that would be realized is not known.*

Response: Urban stream restoration benefits include stabilization of impacted streams, restoration of stream ecology, protection of critical infrastructure as applicable, and enhancement of aquatic and terrestrial habitat, by employing natural channel design techniques approved by the Chesapeake Bay Program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

The techniques and approach of urban stream restoration to reduce pollution and enhance stream ecology are found in the Chesapeake Bay Program's *Recommendations of the Expert Panel to Define Removal Rates for Individual Stream Restoration Projects* (Expert Panel Report) that was developed over a number of years with a diverse group of professionals on the expert panel, including environmental scientists, wetland scientists, stream restoration experts, soil scientists, and civil engineers from state agencies, universities, local government, and the private sector. The Expert Panel Report went through a rigorous multi-year review and approval process by Bay Program groups comprised of a diverse group of professionals. These review bodies included the Urban Stormwater Work Group (USWG), the Watershed Technical Work Group (WTWG), and the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT). The final Expert Panel Report includes four protocols that define the pollutant reductions associated with individual stream projects predicated on extensive research and testing. The practice of urban stream restoration is being applied to over 441 miles of urban streams in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed to help states meet Watershed Implementation Plan goals to clean up the Bay.

Site-specific field investigations were conducted to determine the nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollution reductions that could be achieved per the protocols in the Expert Panel Report by restoring the stream using natural channel design techniques.

4. Comment: *I believe that the City should postpone the project until a fuller assessment of the environmental pros and cons and alternative ways of reducing storm water runoff into the stream can be evaluated.*

Response: Perennial streams are fed by stormwater runoff from rainfall and groundwater as baseflow which allows for year-round flow. These two sources of water are key to ensure perennial streams always flow to support the ecosystem. Perennial

urban streams can be negatively impacted by urban development in the streams' drainage area. Taylor Run has been heavily impacted by stormwater flows and pollution from urban development in the local watershed built prior to the current stormwater management requirements.

Other impacts of urban development include realignment of Taylor Run as evidenced by historic aerial photography, piping of the upstream portion to where it exits or 'daylights' at the end of the stormwater pipe at the Chinquapin Recreation Center in Forest Park, and the historic placement of concrete debris in the stream bed as a an old, unsuccessful practice to reduce erosive flows.

The City previously performed a Phase 1 and Phase II Stream Assessment to classify the City's streams and condition. Building on this work, the City performed the Phase III Stream Assessment: Stream Restoration and Outfall Rehabilitation Study (Phase III Stream Assessment, February 2019). This assessment was conducted by a diverse group of professionals comprised of a private consulting team experienced in urban stream restoration and City staff with T&ES, RPCA, and DPI. The Phase III Stream Assessment considered the feasibility and prioritization of five streams as candidates for restoration. Field investigations included site-specific analysis for each of the five stream reaches to determine the nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollution reductions that could be achieved per the protocols in the Expert Panel Report by restoring the stream using natural channel design techniques. The City identified Taylor Run as a top candidate for urban stream restoration based on erosion, bank stability, and other factors and calculated the pollutant reductions based on these site-specific data.

5. Comment: *As for the quality of life consequences of the project, it is important to recognize that the Taylor Run valley is one of Alexandria's natural gems. As such, it should receive special attention and efforts to maintain this status. The valley is filled with many large (in some cases massive) native trees. There is also an unusual wetlands and a seepage swamp that is not only unique to Alexandria but rare elsewhere as well. ...*

Response: Other impacts of urban development include realignment of Taylor Run as evidenced by historic aerial photography, piping of the upstream portion to where it exits or 'daylights' at the end of the stormwater pipe at the Chinquapin Recreation Center in Forest Park, and the historic placement of concrete debris in the stream bed as a an old, unsuccessful practice to reduce erosive flows. The increased flow of stormwater runoff from this outfall due to urban development has greatly eroded the stream channel.

This erosion has caused 'downcutting' that has lowered the stream bottom and impacted aquatic habitat and eroded the stream banks to undermine trees causing them to fall into the stream resulting in tree loss. Through the implementation of natural channel design techniques consistent with the Expert Panel Report, the project will slow the flows of stormwater to mitigate these impacts. The City has put together a diverse project team to maximize cost-effective pollution reduction and environmental benefits in the design and implementation the project.

6. Comment: *On the other hand, the project would require the cutting of a large number (maybe several hundred) of mature native trees and the stripping of what would be a significantly widened stream bed. As far as I am aware, the pollution reduction value of the trees that would be removed has not been calculated though it is likely to be considerable. This value could possibly be greater than the pollution reduction value of the "restoration."*

Response: The restoration is being designed to raise the stream bed that has been lowered by ongoing erosion, which will at times of high flow periodically create a connection to the adjacent wetlands and help maintain healthy inundation of these wetlands. Stabilizing the banks to mitigate erosion and tree loss will be accomplished without having to appreciably widen the stream or impact the existing walking trail. T&ES staff has continued to work closely with RPCA staff and the consultant to maximize the environmental benefits of the project. This includes refining the limits of disturbance to mitigate impacts to trees identified for saving and not impacting the wetlands, as well as replanting and establishment of native vegetation and the protection of existing low-growing vegetation. In addition to cost-effectively reducing nutrient and sediment pollution to address state and federal Bay clean up mandates, the Taylor Run Stream Restoration is being designed to deliver 'co-benefits' such as, enhancement of the aquatic and terrestrial habitat, protection of critical infrastructure, and stabilization of the ecosystem to improve the resiliency of the stream from further impacts. Without the stabilization of the bed and banks, the stream will continue to erode and trees will continue to be undermined and die, falling into the stream which in turn creates blockages. Saved and replanted vegetation as part of the stream restoration will provide ecosystem stability and offer additional pollution removal to the overwhelming pollutant removal accomplished by restoration of the stream channel.

7. Comment: *In sum, the pros and cons of the Taylor Run project need a deeper look, including a look at potentially less expensive ways of meeting pollution goals by keeping storm water out of the stream as an initial matter. Postponement of the project would allow this assessment and would at the same time help the City's efforts to reduce expenses as it amends its proposed budget in light of the likely revenue reductions caused by the current national health emergency.*

Response: Urban stream restoration is one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce the impacts of urban development and reduce nutrient and sediment pollution to our local waterways, the Potomac River, and the Chesapeake Bay. The City has performed an in-depth assessment of the City's stream through three phases of stream assessments. The Phase III Stream Assessment gathered site-specific data of Taylor Run and employed the techniques of the Chesapeake Bay's Expert Panel Report to determine pollution reductions for the restoration. The design of the restoration is being performed by a professional consulting firm with extensive experience stream restoration design and a diverse group of City staff across departments to ensure adherence to proper design and landscape guidelines for the restoration.

The Taylor Run Stream Restoration total project cost of \$4.45M has been awarded a 50/50 matching SLAF grant of \$2.225M from VDEQ, with the City

match portion coming from prior allocated funds from the Stormwater Utility fee that is a dedicated funding source that can only be used for stormwater management projects per Virginia law. There is no additional funding impact for FY 2021.

Attachments

Attachment #1 – March 27, 2020 Email from Mr. Russell Bailey to Mayor Wilson, City Manager Jinks and City Staff

Attachment #1: March 27, 2020 Email from Mr. Russell Bailey to Mayor Wilson, City Manager Jinks and City Staff

From: Russell Bailey <rrussell.bailey@gmail.com>

Date: March 27, 2020 at 2:04:59 AM EDT

To: "Mark.Jinks@alexandriava.gov" <Mark.Jinks@alexandriava.gov>

Cc: Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@alexandriava.gov>, "jesse.maines@alexandriava.gov" <jesse.maines@alexandriava.gov>, "justin.wilson@alexandriava.gov" <justin.wilson@alexandriava.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL]Recommended item to cut from City budget: Taylor Run Stream Restoration

Dear Mr. Jinks:

In the current re-evaluation of its budget Alexandria should be seeking to cut non-essential or less than essential projects. This is to suggest that Alexandria defer the proposed Taylor Run stream restoration project. The project is likely to be highly controversial as it receives further public vetting, is not necessary at the moment to meet the City's water pollution reduction goals under its Chesapeake Bay Action Plan, and deferral would reduce the City's expenses in the near term by \$2.25 million.

Discussion:

I am a resident of Alexandria who uses the City's parks almost daily, including Taylor Run frequently. For the reasons set out below, I have been concerned that the proposed stream restoration project for Taylor Run Valley may have greater environmental and "quality of life" costs than benefits. I believe that the City should postpone the project until a fuller assessment of the environmental pros and cons and alternative ways of reducing storm water runoff into the stream can be evaluated. Given that the restoration is not necessary to meet Alexandria's current Chesapeake Bay pollution reduction obligations, deferral of the project would be a good cost reduction step in the current budget revision.

According to a City fact sheet, the project would reduce phosphorus and nitrogen runoff by 30 percent and 9 percent respectively. These numbers, however, were reached not by a site-specific analysis but by the application of a generic formula. Thus, the actual pollution reduction that would be realized is not known.

On the other hand, the project would require the cutting of a large number (maybe several hundred) of mature native trees and the stripping of what would be a significantly widened stream bed. As far as I am aware, the pollution reduction value of the trees that would be removed has not been calculated though it is likely to be considerable. This value could possibly be greater than the pollution reduction value of the "restoration." In other words, the project could be counter productive as an environmental matter. (I would note that two of the purported benefits the City has cited are invasive removal and improved wildlife habitat seem to be a bit "make weight." Through intensive efforts by the City over the last several years virtually all the invasive species on the City's portion of the valley have been eradicated, and the wildlife in the park is doing quite well right now.)

As for the quality of life consequences of the project, it is important to recognize that the Taylor

Run valley is one of Alexandria's natural gems. As such, it should receive special attention and efforts to maintain this status. The valley is filled with many large (in some cases massive) native trees. There is also a unusual wetlands and a seepage swamp that is not only unique to Alexandria but rare elsewhere as well. The wetlands and swamp contain an extraordinary variety of ferns, sedges and wildflowers that could be jeopardized by the project. The plan is to try to protect these fecund areas, but with the project's planned raising of the stream bed, the jeopardy to them will be increased. Also, while the plan is to replant native trees and shrubs along the stream and hillside, the fact is that no one receiving or sending this e-mail will be alive to see the forest restored to what it already is today.

In these circumstances, the project should be postponed. Alexandria expects to "far exceed" its 40 percent pollution reduction requirement specified in Phase 2 (2018-2023) of its Chesapeake Bay Action Plan without the Taylor Run project, or even the Taylor Run and two other projects - Strawberry Hill and Lucky Run - collectively. See Alexandria's Phase 2 Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Action Plan for 40% Compliance, pp. 3 and 23. (Note that the Taylor Run project is by far the most expensive of the three projects but does not seem be produce a clearly greater pollution reduction.)

In sum, the pros and cons of the Taylor Run project need a deeper look, including a look at potentially less expensive ways of meeting pollution goals by keeping storm water out of the stream as an initial matter. Postponement of the project would allow this assessment and would at the same time help the City's efforts to reduce expenses as it amends its proposed budget in light of the likely revenue reductions caused by the current national health emergency.

Thank you for your careful consideration of these views.

Sincerely,

Russell Bailey
705 North Overlook Drive
571-696-5534

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 1, 2020

Question:

Does the City of Alexandria have the ability to enter into voluntary collection agreements or similar arrangements with VRBO and HomeAway?

Response:

The Department of Finance has reached out to VRBO and HomeAway, computer platform companies that facilitate short-term residential rentals similar to AirBnB.

Whereas the City of Alexandria was the first jurisdiction in Virginia to enter into a Voluntary Collection Agreement (VCA) with Airbnb (effective April 2018), VRBO/HomeAway report that they do not enter into such agreements with all localities. Their preference is to only work with larger jurisdictions. Staff is not aware of any VRBO/HomeAway collection agreements in other Virginia jurisdictions at this time.

Staff is continuing discussions with their offices in Seattle and Chicago and provided copies of the City's Transient Lodging ordinance. While no decisions have been made, staff has had positive discussions with them and is cautiously optimistic that they may agree to work with the City in the future. There are limited rentals occurring during the present health crisis, VRBO/HomeAway indicate that there are approximately 65 such listings in the City. Staff have already identified approximately 39 of these through its third-party data analytics contract with Host Compliance. A VCA with VRBO/HomeAway could generate between \$40,000 to \$80,000 annually in Transient Lodging tax revenue under normal circumstances. Staff will continue to pursue establishing this VCA.

For comparison, under the Airbnb VCA in FY 2020, the City collected \$385,223 in Transient Lodging taxes through February, an increase of 67% over the same time in the prior year. Rentals. Collections are, of course, expected to dwindle for the remainder of the fiscal year due COVID-19.

Airbnb has the greatest market share in the City for rental platforms, representing 99% of the 454 known rentals. The 64 other potential rentals currently being researched by staff, would drop Airbnb's market percentage to 87%.

**FY City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 12, 2020

Question: What are the potential revenues, costs, benefits and drawbacks of implementing the disposable plastic bag tax recently allowed by the State? (Mayor Wilson)

Response:

This is in response to the passage of Virginia SB11, which authorizes any county or city to impose a tax of five cents per bag on disposable plastic bags provided to consumers by certain retailers beginning no earlier than January 1, 2021. The plastic bag tax aligns with the City's goals in the WasteSmart Strategic Plan and the Environmental Action Plan. The bill was also a City Council Legislative Package priority, for which the City's Legislative Director worked closely with the General Assembly to get the bill passed.

SB11 only applies to grocery stores, convenience stores and drug stores, of which there are approximately 100 in the City. It excludes food establishments and restaurants and does not apply to paper bags. It also limits the City's share to three of the five cents in the first year and four cents in each subsequent year and allows the Commonwealth to deduct administrative costs for collection, enforcement and dispersal. Staff estimates implementation of this new tax would generate less than \$50,000 annually in revenue.

SB11 states that "The Tax Commissioner shall develop and make publicly available guidelines implementing the provisions of this article." Staff recommends awaiting the issuance of guidelines in order to gather more clarity before fully developing the City's ordinance. The earliest the City could implement this tax is January 1, 2021, and the City would be required to provide a certified copy of the City's plastic bag tax ordinance to the Tax Commissioner at least three months prior to the tax effective date.

Utilizing the State's guidelines (to be published), staff will develop a draft ordinance and implementation plan in the summer and fall including Council's concurrence to be ready to submit to the State Tax Commissioner. However, there are concerns with the current COVID-19 crisis that plastic bags are safer than reusable bags. Some states and localities have delayed implementation (Maine) and some have banned the use of reusable bags or lifted plastic bag rules (Massachusetts, Illinois, New Hampshire, City and County of San Francisco, and others). Staff will monitor the situation throughout the summer and into the early fall, and then make a recommendation to City Council.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

May 18, 2020

Question:

Please provide final budget comments submitted online after the FY 2021 Revised 2.0 Budget Presentation.

Response:

Comment # 22

In these tight budget times, I am heartened to hear the budget proposal intends to use existing Capital Improvement Program funds to fund the costs of hiring the consultants to assist the City with the Plan Update. I urge that Council continues to keep in mind that reduced GHG emissions are critical to public health now and in the long-term.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 21, 2020

Question:

Please provide budget comments submitted online regarding the FY 2021 Proposed Budget.

Response:

Comment # 18

I am writing to you as the President of Fairlington Mews Condominium Association. Our association borders King Street in Alexandria from intersection of S. Wakefield St. in Arlington to the entrance ramp of I-395 on the south side of the overpass. Our association recently spent over \$60,000 to clean up the appearance of this area along the roadside. We removed an unsightly dying hedge, installed a new wooden fence to replace a chain link one and removed many pounds of trash hiding behind the hedge. We are currently maintaining the grass on the King Street side of our wooden fence and continuing to clean up litter thrown from cars along this area (even though that property belongs to the city of Alexandria) because we take pride in our neighborhood. I was disappointed to hear that the City Manager's proposed annual operating budget for FY21 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2021-2030 is not addressing this particular area along with the sections of King Street bordering Fairlington Arbor and Fairlington Glen all the way to Quaker Lane. I respectfully request that the City of Alexandria provide funding to address long-delayed stormwater management and landscaping improvements along King Street from North Quaker Lane to I-395. Adequate funding should be provided in both the City's operating budget and the CIP. King Street East off of I-395 is heavily used by an ever-increasing population. We are also the first thing the tourists see as they travel east on King Street after getting off I-395 heading towards Old Town. The landscape along King Street needs some attention. Many trees along the roadway are badly damaged, stunted, or in poor health. Please consider improving the appearance of this area and let us know what we can do to help. Thanks for your consideration,

Comment # 19 *(after revised budget presented 4.7.2020)*

City has a large budget already. City employees get the cut. City employees already are the lowest paid employees in the whole region. Other neighboring depts keep their raised. Which were already much higher to begin with. Don't tell us that we are at competitive pay when the avg disparity is already greater than 5,000-7,000 per year at the same level. Now the city cuts what have?? You're running your employees into the ground. This is a PRIME reason why you are CONSTANTLY losing employees to places like Fairfax. The city's budget is pretty large. They city wouldn't have to keep continual hiring if they paid us, the employee, on equal footing as the city 10 min away. There are a few hundred employees I can likely speak for that feel the same.

Comment # 20

Thank you for crafting a responsible revised budget in a quick turnaround that responds to the City's challenging circumstances. I also write to request that the City consider how it can continue to advance the Energy and Climate Change Action Plan Update without delay. This was removed from the draft budget with a note "funded by moving to CIP" but does not appear in the CIP in the coming year as far as I can tell. This plan is needed to provide guidance to City programs and capital projects that will be restarted when the City's fiscal position recovers. Without the plan, the City will not have a strategy to meet its commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 50% by 2030. Fighting climate change is a near-term public health need as well as a long-term sustainable concern. I urge you to please find funding in the energy program budget that can keep this important work moving in FY21. Thank you.

Comment # 21

Comments about the FY 2021 Budget City of Alexandria April 18, 2020 Public Hearing Thank you for this opportunity to address you this morning. I am a resident of Alexandria and am an active advocate for the City's Environmental Action Plan 2040. I have met with several of you, as well as staff, regarding the goals presented in the EAP on Climate and Energy. First and foremost, let me state that I recognize the necessary and immediate focus on the health and safety of our families and neighbors during this very difficult public health crisis. I am grateful for the impressive continuity of City government exercised by you, our elected officials and by city employees. I am grateful for the full disclosure of COVID-19 related information that is updated daily on the city's website and discussed during the many town halls and other public meetings. My comments about the proposed budget come to you acknowledging that we are experiencing a very serious and scary public health, social and economic situation. But my comments come to you knowing that you declared a climate emergency in Alexandria and committed to a "citywide just transition and climate emergency mobilization effort to reverse global warming" To this end, you reaffirmed your commitment to the goals, targets and actions set forth in the City's Environmental Action Plan 2040 in your unanimous declaration. As you know, the most immediate goal is to reduce community wide GHG emissions by 50% v/v 2005. As I read the City Manager's Proposed Budget for FY21, which will guide our future path, I was hopeful that there would be some indication that your commitment to reducing GHG emissions was still alive. When I saw that the funding to update the Energy and Climate Action Plan had been removed entirely and not deferred, I was concerned. Another concern in this proposed budget was the reduction of the support for the Energy Management Plan. Both plans support the goals of the EAP. I am here to ask you to do everything you can, in light of this crisis, to not lose sight of the ecologically sound goals and targets in the EAP 2040. Dialing back on your commitment to reduce GHG emissions will only worsen the quality of the air we breathe, continue to threaten public health and compromise a much needed ecologically sound recovery. Smart economic recovery and growth goes hand in hand with combating climate change. We cannot take our eyes off the goal of reducing GHG emissions if we want a strong recovery. Climate disasters, such as rising sea levels that threaten our City will continue if we lose sight of our commitments to reduce GHG emissions and reign in disastrous effects of climate change. The cost and the challenges to reducing GHG emissions, will increase if we wait to design and implement the action plans necessary to accomplish this goal. Before this crisis, the budget included funding for the Energy and Climate Change Task Force.

In meetings with Department of Energy staff, I learned that this task force was to be comprised of a broad and diverse representation of citizens and would work with a hired consultant to update the 2012 Energy and Climate Change Action Plan. The creation of the task force is an exciting opportunity for collaboration with climate change and energy experts and the citizenry of Alexandria. Alexandrians will become more informed involved and engaged citizens in protecting the health and welfare of the community. The EAP goals of Climate, Energy and Implementation, Education and Outreach will be positively impacted by the activities of the Task Force for years to come. The upfront investment for the consultant (\$110,000) will be paid back many times over by protecting public health, informing citizens, growing a base of climate and energy experts and demonstrating your commitment to safeguard the environment for our future residents. As Jamie Margolin, 18 years of age and founder of the Zero Hour, asked in his WP op-ed "I will stay home to save the old, what will you do to save the young? ". (March 29, Wash. Post) Please consider adding back to the budget \$110,000 for the Energy and Climate Change Task Force. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

**City of Alexandria, Virginia
FY 2021 Proposed Operating Budget & CIP
Budget Questions & Answers**

April 21, 2020

Question:

Please provide budget comments submitted online regarding the FY 2021 Proposed Budget.

Response:

Comment # 18

I am writing to you as the President of Fairlington Mews Condominium Association. Our association borders King Street in Alexandria from intersection of S. Wakefield St. in Arlington to the entrance ramp of I-395 on the south side of the overpass. Our association recently spent over \$60,000 to clean up the appearance of this area along the roadside. We removed an unsightly dying hedge, installed a new wooden fence to replace a chain link one and removed many pounds of trash hiding behind the hedge. We are currently maintaining the grass on the King Street side of our wooden fence and continuing to clean up litter thrown from cars along this area (even though that property belongs to the city of Alexandria) because we take pride in our neighborhood. I was disappointed to hear that the City Manager's proposed annual operating budget for FY21 and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2021-2030 is not addressing this particular area along with the sections of King Street bordering Fairlington Arbor and Fairlington Glen all the way to Quaker Lane. I respectfully request that the City of Alexandria provide funding to address long-delayed stormwater management and landscaping improvements along King Street from North Quaker Lane to I-395. Adequate funding should be provided in both the City's operating budget and the CIP. King Street East off of I-395 is heavily used by an ever-increasing population. We are also the first thing the tourists see as they travel east on King Street after getting off I-395 heading towards Old Town. The landscape along King Street needs some attention. Many trees along the roadway are badly damaged, stunted, or in poor health. Please consider improving the appearance of this area and let us know what we can do to help. Thanks for your consideration,

Comment # 19 *(after revised budget presented 4.7.2020)*

City has a large budget already. City employees get the cut. City employees already are the lowest paid employees in the whole region. Other neighboring depts keep their raised. Which were already much higher to begin with. Don't tell us that we are at competitive pay when the avg disparity is already greater than 5,000-7,000 per year at the same level. Now the city cuts what have?? You're running your employees into the ground. This is a PRIME reason why you are CONSTANTLY losing employees to places like Fairfax. The city's budget is pretty large. They city wouldn't have to keep continual hiring if they paid us, the employee, on equal footing as the city 10 min away. There are a few hundred employees I can likely speak for that feel the same.

Comment # 20

Thank you for crafting a responsible revised budget in a quick turnaround that responds to the City's challenging circumstances. I also write to request that the City consider how it can continue to advance the Energy and Climate Change Action Plan Update without delay. This was removed from the draft budget with a note "funded by moving to CIP" but does not appear in the CIP in the coming year as far as I can tell. This plan is needed to provide guidance to City programs and capital projects that will be restarted when the City's fiscal position recovers. Without the plan, the City will not have a strategy to meet its commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 50% by 2030. Fighting climate change is a near-term public health need as well as a long-term sustainable concern. I urge you to please find funding in the energy program budget that can keep this important work moving in FY21. Thank you.

Comment # 21

Comments about the FY 2021 Budget City of Alexandria April 18, 2020 Public Hearing Thank you for this opportunity to address you this morning. I am a resident of Alexandria and am an active advocate for the City's Environmental Action Plan 2040. I have met with several of you, as well as staff, regarding the goals presented in the EAP on Climate and Energy. First and foremost, let me state that I recognize the necessary and immediate focus on the health and safety of our families and neighbors during this very difficult public health crisis. I am grateful for the impressive continuity of City government exercised by you, our elected officials and by city employees. I am grateful for the full disclosure of COVID-19 related information that is updated daily on the city's website and discussed during the many town halls and other public meetings. My comments about the proposed budget come to you acknowledging that we are experiencing a very serious and scary public health, social and economic situation. But my comments come to you knowing that you declared a climate emergency in Alexandria and committed to a "citywide just transition and climate emergency mobilization effort to reverse global warming" To this end, you reaffirmed your commitment to the goals, targets and actions set forth in the City's Environmental Action Plan 2040 in your unanimous declaration. As you know, the most immediate goal is to reduce community wide GHG emissions by 50% v/v 2005. As I read the City Manager's Proposed Budget for FY21, which will guide our future path, I was hopeful that there would be some indication that your commitment to reducing GHG emissions was still alive. When I saw that the funding to update the Energy and Climate Action Plan had been removed entirely and not deferred, I was concerned. Another concern in this proposed budget was the reduction of the support for the Energy Management Plan. Both plans support the goals of the EAP. I am here to ask you to do everything you can, in light of this crisis, to not lose sight of the ecologically sound goals and targets in the EAP 2040. Dialing back on your commitment to reduce GHG emissions will only worsen the quality of the air we breathe, continue to threaten public health and compromise a much needed ecologically sound recovery. Smart economic recovery and growth goes hand in hand with combating climate change. We cannot take our eyes off the goal of reducing GHG emissions if we want a strong recovery. Climate disasters, such as rising sea levels that threaten our City will continue if we lose sight of our commitments to reduce GHG emissions and reign in disastrous effects of climate change. The cost and the challenges to reducing GHG emissions, will increase if we wait to design and implement the action plans necessary to accomplish this goal. Before this crisis, the budget included funding for the Energy and Climate Change Task Force.

In meetings with Department of Energy staff, I learned that this task force was to be comprised of a broad and diverse representation of citizens and would work with a hired consultant to update the 2012 Energy and Climate Change Action Plan. The creation of the task force is an exciting opportunity for collaboration with climate change and energy experts and the citizenry of Alexandria. Alexandrians will become more informed involved and engaged citizens in protecting the health and welfare of the community. The EAP goals of Climate, Energy and Implementation, Education and Outreach will be positively impacted by the activities of the Task Force for years to come. The upfront investment for the consultant (\$110,000) will be paid back many times over by protecting public health, informing citizens, growing a base of climate and energy experts and demonstrating your commitment to safeguard the environment for our future residents. As Jamie Margolin, 18 years of age and founder of the Zero Hour, asked in his WP op-ed "I will stay home to save the old, what will you do to save the young? ". (March 29, Wash. Post) Please consider adding back to the budget \$110,000 for the Energy and Climate Change Task Force. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.